5-1982

A Mass Media Campaign to Promote Divorce Adjustment

James C. Gardiner
Utah State University

Dear Elwin,

Thank you for being my major professor, & for encouraging me through all the trying times. I feel a great deal of satisfaction with the accomplishment of the degree.

Thanks again!

Jim Gardiner

A MASS MEDIA CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE DIVORCE ADJUSTMENT

by

James Carl Gardiner

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1982

DEDICATION

to Carole, who taught me about divorce,

to Cindy, who is teaching me about marriage, and

to Dan, Tex, and Adam, who are teaching me about life.

James Carl Gardiner

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A special thank you goes to the following group of persons and agencies, whose cooperation and assistance made this study possible:

--To Drs. Black, Cardon, Dobson, Nielsen, and Shaver, whose patience, encouragement, and technical expertise were both vital and greatly appreciated.

--To the 101 divorced persons in Box Elder County, Utah, who cooperated as subjects in the study.

--To the Bear River Community Mental Health Center, for wholeheartedly backing the research effort.

--To the editors of the Ogden Standard Examiner, Box Elder News and Journal, and Tremonton Leader/Garland Times for providing newspaper space for the campaign messages.

--To the manager of station KBUH in Brigham City, Utah, for providing generous prime-time air space for the campaign radio messages.

--To the mayor and city council of Brigham City, who helped promote the campaign.

--To the Box Elder County Clerk's office, for assistance in making the public divorce documents accessible.

--To Drs. Fairbank, Finney, Janiak, and Price, and the panel of divorced persons, for evaluating the campaign messages.

--To Cindy Gardiner, my wife, who provided assistance and inspiration at every stage of the project.

James Carl Gardiner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

DEDICATION ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

ABSTRACT x

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem 1
Objectives 3
Hypotheses 4

II. RELATED LITERATURE 5

Divorce Adjustment 5

Emotional Difficulties Associated with Divorce 5
Factors Associated with Emotional Adjustment 8
Help-Seeking Behaviors 8
Timetable of Divorce Recovery 10

Prevention 12
Mass Media Effects 16

Early Approaches to Media Effects 17
Contemporary Approaches to Media Effects 19
Media Information Campaigns 22
Conditions for Successful and Unsuccessful Media Campaigns 26

Local Studies 28
Summary of Implications 30

III. METHOD 32

Design 32
Subjects 35

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Target Population	35
Selection and Assignment of Subjects	36
Locating the Subjects	37
Ethical Considerations	39
Mass Media Campaign	40
Objectives and Audience Analysis	40
Campaign Strategy	42
Data and Instrumentation	47
Demographic Characteristics	48
Utilization of the Campaign	48
Attachment to Ex-Spouse	49
Emotional Adjustment to Divorce	50
Data Analysis	52
Hypothesis Tests	54
Additional Analyses	55
IV. RESULTS	58
Demographics and Divorce-Related Variables	58
Utilization of the Media Campaign	59
Test of Hypothesis 1: Newsletter and Reported Media Use	61
t-Test Results	61
Breakdown by Type of Media	62
Frequency Distribution of Results	65
Non-Parametric Statistical Results	65
Test of Hypothesis 2: Media Use and Emotional Change	68
Reported Overall Emotional Changes	69
The Test of Hypothesis 2	71
Covariance Analysis of Posttest Scores	74
Covariance Analysis of Change Scores	80
Frequency Distributions	85
Additional Analyses	91
Sex Differences	91
Age Differences	91

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Marital Status 93
Person Who Filed for Divorce 93
Religious Affiliation 93
Use of Local Media 97
Use of Psychotherapy 97
Availability of Confidants 97
Reported Time with Confidants 101
Reported Media Use X Time with Confidants 101

Summary of Results 106

V. DISCUSSION 110

Reported Use of the Campaign 110
The Newsletter and Reported Media Use 111
Emotional Changes 112

Reported Emotional Changes for All Subjects Combined 112
The Test of Hypothesis 2 115
Additional Analyses 116

Limitations 119
Future Research 122
Conclusion 124

REFERENCE NOTES 127

REFERENCES 128

APPENDICES 134

Appendix A: Campaign Messages 135
Appendix B: Newsletter 162
Appendix C: Rating Scale for Professionals 166
Appendix D: Rating Scale for Divorced Persons 168
Appendix E: Demographic Questionnaire 170
Appendix F: Attachment Measure 172
Appendix G: Depression, Anxiety, and Hostility Measure 174

VITA 176

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table

1. Divorce, Marriage, and Personal Income: Box Elder County, State of Utah, and the United States . . . 36

2. Ratings of Messages by Judges and Divorced Persons. 47

3. Reliability Results for Measures of Attachment, Depression, Anxiety, and Hostility 50

4. Reported Use of the Divorce Adjustment Media Campaign by Recently Divorced Persons (N = 101) 60

5. Reported Media Use in the Experimental and Control Groups: Test of Hypothesis 1 62

6. Reported Use of Newspapers, Television, Radio, Magazines, and Books by the Experimental and Control Groups 63

7. Correlations Between Reported Media Use and Receipt of Newsletter 64

8. Frequency Distribution of Reported Media Use by Experimental and Control Groups 66

9. Mann-Whitney U Results for Reported Media Use in Experimental and Control Groups 67

10. Median Test Results for Reported Media Use in Experimental and Control Groups 67

11. Pre-Post Emotional Changes During the Five-Week Media Campaign for All Subjects Combined 70

12. Emotional Change Differences for Media Use Groups: The Test of Hypothesis 2 72

13. Correlations Between Reported Emotional Change and Other Variables (N = 70) 73

14. Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Posttest Attachment Scores 76

15. Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Posttest Depression Scores 77

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Page

Table

16. Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Posttest Anxiety Scores 78

17. Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Posttest Hostility Scores 79

18. Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Attachment Change During the Media Campaign 81

19. Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Depression Change During the Media Campaign 82

20. Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Anxiety Change During the Media Campaign 83

21. Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Hostility Change During the Media Campaign 84

22. Frequency Distribution of Attachment Change Scores, Subdivided by Reported Media Use Groups 86

23. Frequency Distribution of Depression Change Scores, Subdivided by Reported Media Use Groups 88

24. Frequency Distribution of Anxiety Change Scores, Subdivided by Reported Media Use Groups 89

25. Frequency Distribution of Hostility Change Scores, Subdivided by Reported Media Use Groups 90

26. Tests of Sex Differences in Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes 92

27. Tests of Age Differences in Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes 94

28. Tests of Marital Status Differences in Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes 95

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Page

Table

29. Tests of Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes by Person Who Filed for Divorce 96

30. Tests of Religious Affiliation Differences in Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes 98

31. Tests of Reported Emotional Changes by Reported Use/Nonuse of Local Media 99

32. Tests of Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes According to Use/Nonuse of Psychotherapy 100

33. Tests of Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes According to Availability of Confidants 102

34. Tests of Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes According to Time with Confidants 103

35. Mean Emotional Changes by Time with Confidants and Media Use 104

36. Analysis of Variance Summaries for Emotional Changes with Time with Confidants X Media Use 105

ABSTRACT

A Mass Media Campaign to Promote
Divorce Adjustment

by

James C. Gardiner, Doctor of Philosophy
Utah State University, 1982

Major Professor: Dr. Elwin Nielsen
Department: Psychology

Introduction. This study produced and evaluated a mass media campaign designed to promote emotional adjustment to divorce.

Hypotheses. (a) Sending a promotional newsletter to divorced persons will increase their reported utilization of the campaign. (b) Divorced persons who report heavy utilization of the campaign will report greater emotional improvement than divorced persons who report light or no utilization of the campaign.

Method. A field experiment was conducted in rural northern Utah. The names of all recently (less than 12 months) divorced persons were obtained from the county clerk and randomly divided into an experimental group, who received a newsletter promoting the media campaign, and a control group. The five-week media campaign included 10 radio shows, 16 newspaper articles, and 29 television shows. After the campaign, 101 subjects were interviewed regarding their media

use. They also completed a posttest and retrospective pretest of anxiety, depression, hostility (measured by the Symptom Check List 90-R), and attachment.

Results. The campaign was reportedly used by 77.2% of the subjects. Hypothesis 1 was weakly supported. Subjects who received the newsletter reported using statistically significantly more media events ($\overline{X}$ = 4.95) than subjects who did not receive the newsletter ($\overline{X}$ = 3.12). However, the percentage of variance in media use associated with newsletter receipt was only 3.2%. Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Heavy campaign users (3+ events) reported statistically significantly greater improvements in anxiety, depression, and hostility (but not attachment) than light users (0-2 events). The percentage of variance in emotional improvements associated with media use ranged from 1 to 5%. Those who reportedly spent time with significant others after the divorce reported significantly greater emotional improvements than those who did not spend time with others. The highest degree of reported emotional improvement was reported by those who reported both heavy media use and time spent with significant others, while the lowest degree of emotional improvement was reported by subjects who reported little or no media use and no time spent with confidants.

(176 pages)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

During the past 25 years, social researchers have begun documenting the psychological difficulties associated with divorce. Those difficulties include depression, anxiety, anger, lingering attachment to the ex-spouse, resentment, loneliness, guilt, fear, parenting problems, increased psychopathology, suicide, and many others (see, for example, Berman & Turk, 1981; Bloom, Asher, & White, 1978; Brown, Feldberg, Fox, & Kohen, 1976; Brown, Felton, Whiteman, & Manela, 1980; Chiriboga & Cutler, 1977; Chiriboga, Roberts, & Stein, 1978; Goode, 1956; Gray, 1978; Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1977; Kraus, 1979; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980; Weiss, 1976; Zeiss, Zeiss, & Johnson, 1980). Kitson and Raschke (1981) reviewed the current literature on divorce and concluded:

> Study after study reports that the divorced are less well adjusted than the married or the widowed. They are more likely to have symptoms of physical and psychological disturbance. (p. 17)

Hetherington and her associates (1977) studied 48 divorced couples and reported:

> We didn't find a single victimless divorce . . . At least one member of each family reported distress or showed a negative change in behavior, particularly during the first year. (p. 46)

The side effects of these emotional conditions often include isolation from a formerly enjoyed social mainstream and a decreased activity level. Many divorced persons have described a meager

existence, where they frequently stay in bed for many hours beyond their sleeping time and isolate themselves from the world around them. These behaviors identify them as an "at risk" group and raise the interest of prevention-oriented mental health professionals. For example, Bloom and his associates (1978) emphasized the need for preventive efforts in behalf of persons experiencing marital breakdown. They lamented that "there are no crisis intervention procedures generally in effect in our society" for marital breakup, and declared it to be

> an irresistible candidate for preventive intervention programs that are well thought out, economically feasible, and subject to careful evaluation. (p. 888)

Recent developments in the mass communication field suggest that the mass media could be a helpful tool for solving the problem of adjustment to divorce. It was reasoned that a media campaign would have a greater probability of reaching isolated and inactive divorced persons than would a self-help group, divorce adjustment class, or other prevention-oriented intervention. However, even a mass communication campaign would likely need to be promoted through outreach efforts. The idea was raised that a newsletter sent to recently divorced persons would call special attention to a media campaign and would increase the probability that those persons would utilize the media events. Such a newsletter would need to be brief, well organized, easy to read, and informative about upcoming media events. It would need to sell divorced persons on the benefits of tuning in to a radio show, reading a divorce-related newspaper article, or checking out a library book on divorce.

To summarize the problem, divorce and its related difficulties are stressful to many persons. Few programs exist in our society for preventing the disorders associated with divorce. While mass media campaigns are a promising alternative for promoting emotional adjustment, no controlled scientific studies have investigated the power of radio, television, newspapers, magazines, or books to provide relief from the stresses associated with divorce. Also, no evidence is available on whether a promotional newsletter that is sent to a media target group can increase utilization of a media campaign.

Objectives

The major objectives of this study were: (a) to determine whether a promotional newsletter sent to recently divorced persons would increase the number of divorce-related media events they would utilize, and (b) to investigate whether a mass media campaign could influence emotional adjustment to divorce.

The secondary objectives were: (c) to design and execute a divorce adjustment media campaign to provide information on coping with the emotional effects of divorce, (d) to determine the extent to which the campaign reached recently divorced persons in the target area, (e) to provide information for mental health decision makers and campaign designers about the feasibility of media campaigns for divorced persons, and (f) to add to the general knowledge about divorce adjustment in the areas of support from friends and family, use of psychotherapy, attitudes toward divorce, length of marriage, age, number of children, sex of respondent, and other pertinent variables.

Hypotheses

The objectives, rationale, and theoretical formulations of this study led to the following hypotheses:

1. Divorced persons receiving a media-promoting newsletter will report utilizing more divorce-related mass media events (i.e., newspaper articles, radio shows, magazine articles, television shows, and books) than divorced persons not receiving a media-promoting newsletter.

2. Divorced persons reporting heavy utilization of an adjustment-promoting mass media campaign will report greater decreases in depression, anxiety, hostility, and attachment to the ex-spouse than divorced persons reporting light or no utilization of an adjustment-promoting media campaign.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

This review of literature includes five sections. First, divorce adjustment is examined, including the difficulties associated with marital breakup, the sources divorced persons turn to for help, time tables for recovery, and factors that influence adjustment. Second, the field of prevention of mental disorders is reviewed to provide a model of intervention for this study. Third, the mass communication field is examined, with emphasis on media effects and health-related information campaigns. Fourth, data that have bearing on the receptivity of the residents in the locale chosen for the study are presented. Finally, the implications drawn from the literature search are summarized.

Divorce Adjustment

Emotional Difficulties Associated with Divorce

This study limited its focus to the post-divorce emotional problems experienced by the divorcing partners. While the divorce-related effects on children are highly important (see, for example, Bane, 1976; or Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980), it was believed that promoting emotional recovery for the divorcing parents would indirectly benefit the children. Also, a more limited focus made the study more manageable.

Three commonly reported emotional problems associated with divorce are depression, anxiety, and hostility (see, for example, Chiriboga &

Cutler, 1977; Chiriboga et al., 1978; Hackney & Ribordy, 1980; Hetherington et al., 1977; Spanier & Casto, 1979; or Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980). Depression is normally associated with feelings of loss, guilt, shame, hopelessness, and loneliness. Anxiety comes as a result of fear of the future, the added responsibilities of being a single parent, or the strain of being alone. Hostilities often arise from the unfinished business between the divorcing partners, from feeling cheated, or from present and past fights.

Another important emotional state frequently associated with divorce and separation is attachment (see, for example, Berman & Turk, 1981; Brown et al., 1980; Hetherington et al., 1977; Spanier & Casto, 1979; or Weiss, 1976). Weiss (1976) introduced the concept of divorce-related attachment as follows: "there persists after the end of most marriages . . . a sense of bonding to the spouse . . ." (p. 138). He observed that while other dimensions of the marriage relationship (e.g., warmth, sexual attraction, trust, respect, or friendship) fade away soon after separation, the attachment or sense of belonging to the ex-spouse persists for an uncomfortably long time. Attachment often results in ambivalence toward the ex-spouse. It explains how the ex-partners can bitterly oppose one another in court or at the lawyer's office during the day, then secretly go out as lovers at night. Only prolonged absence from the ex-partner and development of a new heterosexual relationship can help dissolve attachment. Brown et al. (1980) found that attachment is distinguishable from generalized distress in divorce. They developed a measure of attachment, and by their research demonstrated that divorced men experienced more

attachment than divorced women. Their prototype of the highly attached person was a man whose wife initiated separation, who was late to consider divorce as a solution, who had involvement with marriage counseling, and who had frequent visits with his ex-wife. Berman and Turk (1981) also studied problems and concerns of divorced persons. Their factor analysis of a problem checklist accounted for a factor they labeled "former spouse contacts." Their items were similar to those used by Brown et al. (1980) to measure attachment. They found that former spouse contact was highly related ($p<.001$) to mood state. In summary, attachment has emerged as an independent concept in the divorce recovery literature, which suggests that attachment be accounted for by the serious divorce adjustment researcher.

Other emotional and behavioral states commonly linked with separation and divorce are feelings of rejection, incompetence, helplessness, unattractiveness, loss of identity (Hetherington et al., 1977), restlessness, guilt (Weiss, 1976), loneliness (Spanier & Casto, 1979; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980), resentment (Brown et al., 1976), and low self-esteem (Gray, 1978; Hetherington et al., 1977; Spanier & Casto, 1979). Bloom et al. (1978) reviewed the studies linking suicide to marital status and concluded that divorced and separated persons have higher suicide rates than any other marital status. They also reported that deaths by homicide, deaths from disease, rates of disease, vulnerability to motor vehicle accidents, involvement in alcoholism, and admissions to mental hospitals were higher among divorced persons than among married or single persons.

Factors Associated with Emotional Adjustment

The divorce adjustment research to date has identified several conditions that make emotional adjustment to divorce difficult. Those conditions include an unexpected separation (Goode, 1956; Spanier & Casto, 1979), having the spouse suggest the divorce (Goode, 1956), having a short time to consider getting a divorce (Goode, 1956), being opposed to or ambivalent about the divorce (Goode, 1956; Spanier & Casto, 1979), being a woman with traditional feminine values (Bloom et al., 1978), being a male (Kitson & Raschke, 1981; Zeiss et al., 1980), having the family disapprove of the marriage or the divorce (Blair, 1970; Goode, 1956), having dependent children (Kitson & Raschke, 1981), being placed in a lower socioeconomic status by the divorce (Blair, 1970; Goode, 1956), remaining attached to the ex-spouse (Weiss, 1976), having a desire to punish the ex-spouse (Goode, 1956), experiencing discrimination as a result of divorce (Goode, 1956), and failing to establish a new set of friends (Spanier & Casto, 1979).

On the other hand, divorce adjustment has been demonstrated as easier under the following conditions: having had an active role in the divorce decision process (Kitson & Raschke, 1981), maintaining high social participation and having a strong support system (Berman & Turk, 1981; Kitson & Raschke, 1981), having a meaningful religious affiliation (Kitson & Raschke, 1981), and being a female with nontraditional gender role values (Kitson & Raschke, 1981; Zeiss et al., 1980).

Help-Seeking Behaviors

A number of research studies have investigated the types of help divorced persons seek when recovering. Chiriboga, Coho, Stein, and

Roberts (1979) investigated the help-seeking behaviors of 310 northern California persons who filed for divorce. They found that over 80% turned to another person or persons for help. Women were somewhat more likely to seek help (87%) than were men (77%). The most frequent source turned to for help was a friend (72% for women and 50% for men). The other commonly used sources of help were the spouse, counselors, relatives, and parents. It was noted that 39% of the men and 32% of the women turned to the spouse for help in recovering from the effects of separation. In fact, the men rated the spouse as the potentially most helpful source of support. However, when asked to rate the source of help that was actually the most helpful, only 4% of the men and 2% of the women indicated the spouse. The most highly rated sources of help were friends (32% for the women and 29% for the men) and counselors (18% for the women and 19% for the men).

From their five-year study of the post-divorce process, Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) reported that 20% of the men and 44% of the women sought professional counseling for dealing with divorce. Most of the male therapy seekers sought individual counseling, while the women were equally divided between individual and group therapy. Kitson and Raschke (1981) commented that while the therapy-seeking behaviors of divorced persons have been documented, no data were available on the outcomes of divorce counseling.

Sabota and Cappas (1979) investigated the attitudinal results of a series of four lectures on divorce adjustment given to 39 divorced or divorcing persons. They documented significant positive changes in attitude toward "myself, divorce, separation, children, work, the

present, the future, and remarriage." They found no significant changes in attitudes toward "marriage, men, women, love, and finances." A weakness in the Sabota and Cappas study was that no control group was included, making it impossible to determine whether the changes were due to the lectures or to other factors such as interaction with friends, psychotherapy, or passage of time.

In summary, it has been shown that approximately 80% of divorced persons turn to others for help with adjustment. Approximately 30% seek out professional therapists, and around 60% confide in friends. While both friends and therapists were rated as helpful, little is known to date about the objective outcomes of helping behaviors.

Timetable of Divorce Recovery

There is disagreement in the divorce literature regarding the amount of time required for successful divorce recovery. This disagreement is due in part to a lack of definition of recovery. Hackney and Ribordy (1980) administered the Beck Depression Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, and Multiple Affect Adjective Check List to 74 persons who were divided into four groups: happily married, undergoing marriage counseling, having filed for divorce, and divorced for six to 12 months. The results of their study showed three phases of divorce adjustment. The first was a traumatic period, with a sharp rise in depression, anxiety, and hostility. This pattern was observed in the marriage counseling group and the group that had filed for divorce. The second phase of divorce adjustment was a period of prolonged stress, which lasted until the divorce proceedings had been initiated. The final phase was termed readjustment. It

occurred between six and 12 months after the divorce became final. They found that persons who had been divorced from six to 12 months were not significantly different from happily married persons on the emotional adjustment indicators. They concluded that divorce adjustment usually lasts from six to 12 months. However, a weakness of the Hackney and Ribordy study is that it utilized a convenient sample and attempted to generalize about developmental processes from groups that may not have been comparable. In addition, their study concluded at 12 months and did not investigate divorce adjustment after the first year.

Hetherington et al. (1977) studied the post-divorce adjustment of 48 divorced couples and their children for two years. They concluded that

> Most members of divorced families were more disturbed and were coping less well at one year following divorce than at two months following divorce. (p. 42)

They also observed a marked period of readjustment and improvement during the second year after the divorce. However, they cautioned that even at the end of the second year, "their continuing problems show that many have not yet completely escaped the aftermath of divorce" (p. 46).

Following a five-year study of 60 divorced families, Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) reported the following timetable of recovery. At the time of divorce, the persons experienced depression, hostility, and feelings of a new beginning. At 18 months post-divorce, they continued to experience depression, loneliness, and anger. They had also

improved their parenting skills and self-concepts. Finally, at the end of five years, just over 50% of the divorced persons were in the range of good adjustment. Wallerstein and Kelly concluded that the average woman took three years to stabilize, while the average man recovered in two years. They also reported that one-third of their sample were not satisfactorily adjusted at the end of five years.

Finally, Spivey and Scherman (1980) studied the adjustment patterns of divorced women. They divided their sample into six groups: divorced 0 to 6 months, divorced 12 to 18 months, divorced 3 1/2 to 4 1/2 years, divorced 6 1/2 or more years, newly married (less than six months), and married without any major changes in the past six months. They concluded that

> The first six months after filing for divorce are the most stressful, but indicators of maladjustment are likely not to appear until six months to a year later. After 3 1/2 years from filing for divorce, stress and indicators of maladjustments in divorced women do not differ from those in continuously married women. (p. 57)

From the findings to date, the best estimate of average time needed for divorce adjustment is two years for men and three years for women. Individual differences, level of pre-divorce stability, and the variables outlined above in the section titled "Factors Associated with Emotional Adjustment" should also be taken into account when attempting to predict a timetable of recovery from divorce.

Prevention

The review of literature has established thus far that divorce and separation are stressful for most parties involved, that the

average person takes between two and three years to recover from divorce, and that as many as one-third of divorced persons maintain a significant level of maladjustment for five years or more. Despite these compelling findings, indicating a clear need for intervention in many cases, relatively few specialized programs exist for helping divorced persons adjust. After their exhaustive review of the divorce literature, Bloom and his associates (1978) "failed to uncover a single controlled study designed to reduce or control these stresses" (p. 886). This section of the review explores the literature on primary prevention of mental disorders in search of an appropriate model for intervention with the problem of divorce adjustment.

Goldston (1977) defined primary prevention of mental and emotional disorders as

> those activities directed to specifically identified vulnerable high-risk groups within the community who have not been labeled as psychiatrically ill and for whom measures can be undertaken to avoid the onset of emotional disturbance and/or to enhance their level of positive mental health. (p. 27)

Earlier, Goldston (1969) labeled prevention efforts as "the most important facets of a comprehensive community mental health program" (p. 199). He advocated the use of mass media such as films, pamphlets, television, radio, and other media to bring mental health messages to the community. He lamented that too often a "shotgun" educational approach is used. That is, general messages about mental health are given to the general community. Those messages seldom apply to the persons who receive them. Goldston advocated a "rifle" approach to primary prevention. The mental health educator should select a specialized group in need of intervention, construct a pertinent

message to help the group, and use cost-effective means to put the message across.

Bloom et al. (1978) applied the concept of prevention of mental disorders to divorce adjustment, calling marital disruption

> an irresistible candidate for preventative intervention programs that are well thought out, economically feasible, and subject to careful evaluation. (p. 888)

They further advocated that

> a limited intervention program be undertaken for a randomly selected group of persons undergoing marital disruption. The program need not be more than six months in length and should start as soon as possible after the physical separation of the couple. (p. 888)

Hollister (1977) provided a stress-oriented model which was helpful for this study of prevention and divorce adjustment. His model of primary prevention proposes four possible prevention strategies: (a) management of the sources of stress, (b) avoidance of stress, (c) building resistance to stress, and (d) stress reaction management. The first two strategies, management of the sources and avoidance of stress, are not helpful with divorce adjustment because the sources of stress are well established by the time divorce occurs. The third strategy, building resistance to stress, may be useful if the intervention is early and before the stresses have a significant effect on the divorced person. The fourth strategy, management of reactions to stress, was the most appropriate model to apply to the problem of divorce adjustment. Since divorced persons have likely experienced stress and have reacted with depression, anxiety, hostility, or a variety of other negative emotions, the role of the prevention agent

is to teach divorced persons how to manage extreme emotional reactions. Hollister defined stress reaction management as

> preventing the person's response to stressors from compounding his problems or becoming more damaging than the impact of the stressors. (pp. 45-46)

He proposed that the prevention agent

> Organize educational, anticipatory guidance or group experiences that can desensitize persons to stressors in order to diminish or modify the inappropriate response. (p. 46)

Hollister (Note 1) also introduced the concept of "strens." According to Hollister, a stren is a factor that builds strength in a person's life. It can be a friendship, a hobby, a feeling of accomplishment at a job, or a membership in a supportive group. Prevention specialists can help divorced persons manage stress by teaching them how to find and utilize appropriate and powerful strens. The divorce adjustment literature has emphasized how strens are important factors to promote recovery from divorce-related stressors (see, for example, Berman & Turk, 1981; Kitson & Raschke, 1981; Zeiss et al., 1980).

Foley and Gorham (1973) challenged prevention-oriented mental health professionals to utilize newly developed mass media techniques for reaching persons needing mental health support by asserting that

> there must be developed new techniques of prevention with a psychological, educational, and motivational thrust--a thrust that has much in common with the techniques utilized by mass media and designed to create a climate for optimal self-actualization. Today the structural foundation for research and experimentation in primary prevention exists in the technical fields of mass communications. (p. 105)

Finally, the President's Commission on Mental Health (1978) recommended promoting mental health through public education. The commission challenged community mental health programs to

> impart mental health information, to foster practices beneficial to people's mental health, and to help people acquire knowledge, skills, and attitudes which may contribute directly to their mental health and the mental health of their families. (p. 23)

They emphasized that "local media can be a strong tool in this process" (p. 23).

In summary, the literature on primary prevention contributed a number of ideas for this study, including targeting "at risk" groups, developing specialized programs to assist those groups, using a stress management approach to prevention, and utilizing techniques available from the field of mass communication to implement prevention programs.

Mass Media Effects

Before embarking on a study of the use of mass media to promote divorce adjustment, a fundamental question was asked: Can the mass media be instrumental in effecting changes in the audience? To answer that question, the review presents an overview of early thinking on the effects of mass communication, a short description of current approaches to media effects, a description of recent scientific investigations of mass media information campaigns, and a list of conditions for successful and unsuccessful media campaigns.

Early Approaches to Media Effects

Communication scholars have studied mass media effects for the past 50 years or more. During the 1930s and 1940s, researchers generally concluded that the mass media had a powerful effect on the audience. That is, a communicator who prepared a message and presented it over the mass media with a specific goal in mind, was likely to successfully reach the goal. That early conclusion about media effects has been called the "hypodermic needle" or "bullet" model of mass communication (Atkin, 1981; Severin & Tankard, 1979).

The 1950s and 1960s have been labeled the "limited effects" period of thinking about mass media effects. During that time a number of sociological studies of media effects failed to confirm the hypodermic needle model, and theorists began drawing more conservative conclusions about the outcomes of mass media efforts. A study in the late 1940s by Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (1948) originated the "two-step flow" hypothesis, which stated that "ideas often flow from radio and print to opinion leaders and from those to the less active sections of the population" (Katz, 1957, p. 61). This hypothesis became one of the primary explanations for the limited media effects found by many researchers during the 1950s and 1960s. The two-step flow was later expanded to the "multi-step flow," which emphasized the many complex interpersonal channels that messages may take when influencing individuals.

Another explanation offered by communication scholars for the minimal influence often found by the media studies was reinforcement. Klapper (1960) stated that

> Within a given audience exposed to particular communications, reinforcement, or at least constancy of opinion, is typically found to be the dominant effect; minor change, as in intensity of opinion, is found to be the next most common; and conversion is typically found to be the most rare. (p. 15)

Selectivity was introduced as a mediating factor which helps determine whether a media campaign has an effect on the audience. Three types of selectivity were discussed by Klapper: Selective exposure is defined as the "tendency of people to expose themselves to mass communications in accord with their existing opinions and interests and to avoid unsympathetic material . . ." (p. 19). Selective perception emphasizes a person's tendency to see or hear messages in a way consistent with existing beliefs, habits, or knowledge. Selective retention posits that after exposure to a message, individuals tend to recall distorted or incomplete portions of the message. Klapper described selectivity as a "protective net in the service of existing predispositions" (p. 25).

While the sociologically-oriented researchers were conducting field studies of mass communication effects, a group of psychologically-oriented investigators were conducting laboratory experiments on the effects of persuasive communication. They generally concluded that media presentations can have a positive effect. However, the effects depend on such variables as the credibility of the communication source (Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953), whether one or both sides of an issue is presented by the source (Hovland, Lumsdaine, & Sheffield, 1949), whether or not fear appeals are used (Janis & Feshbach, 1953), the persuasibility of the audience (Janis, Hovland, Field, Linton, Graham, Cohen, Rife, Abelson, Lesser, & King, 1959), the

condition of the communication channel (Festinger & Maccoby, 1964), and numerous other factors (see Rosnow & Robinson, 1967).

Thus, the early research on the effects of mass communication produced conflicting results. On the one hand, the field studies of the sociological researchers found support for limited effects. On the other hand, the initial studies in the field and the laboratory studies by the psychological researchers found more powerful effects, depending on source, message, channel, and receiver variables that were manipulated.

Contemporary Approaches to Media Effects

Severin and Tankard (1979) characterized the 1970s as the "moderate effects" period of thinking about mass media effects. They divided the current thinking about mass communication into four approaches: information seeking, uses and gratifications, agenda setting, and cultural norms.

The information seeking approach to mass communication effects grew out of scientific investigations of selective exposure, which predicts that people seek out information that supports or reinforces their existing attitudes. Studies in the area of information seeking have focused on factors that determine the communication receiver's choices of messages to attend to. Researchers have determined that factors other than information seeking are many times more important than a singular desire for information. Those factors include usefulness of the information, intrinsic interest in the subject, entertainment value, variety, and personality characteristics of the receiver (Severin & Tankard, 1979).

The uses and gratifications approach to media effects postulates that people utilize the media to fulfill social and psychological needs. It focuses on "what people do with media rather than what the media do to people" (Roberts & Bachen, 1981, p. 315). Extensive multi-cultural studies of the needs that people apparently fulfill by utilizing the mass media have been clustered into four basic areas: seeking personal identity, social contact, entertainment, and knowledge about the world (Roberts & Bachen, 1981). The uses and gratifications approach has been criticized for being atheoretical, for lacking empirical demonstration of the hypothesized needs that motivate media use, and for relying too heavily on self-report data. However, it has been a valuable contribution to theory building in the field of mass communication, in that it changed the emphasis from the audience as passive recipients of messages to the audience as active participants n the communication process.

The agenda setting approach to mass media effects emphasizes the ability of the media to "select and emphasize certain issues and thereby cause those issues to be perceived as important by the public" (Severin & Tankard, 1979, p. 253). Cohen's (1963) frequently quoted phrase illustrates the agenda setting approach, as it applies to the print media: "It may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think <u>about</u>" (p. 13). Agenda setting has been heavily researched during the past decade. Roberts and Bachen's (1981) review cited growing evidence that the mass media can cause audience interest in the issues presented. Newspapers apparently are the most powerful

medium for setting local agendas, while television appears to be the most powerful agenda setter for national issues (Palmgreen & Clarke, 1977). The agenda setting hypothesis has thus become established as an important area of mass communication research.

The cultural norms approach to mass communication effects postulates that the media create images in the receivers' minds about the culture's standards of conduct, and thus indirectly influence behavior and living patterns (Severin & Tankard, 1979). DeFleur (1970), who popularized the cultural norms idea, stated that the media can reinforce cultural norms, activate behaviors, or even create norms, but cannot convert or change well established norms. DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach (1982) expanded the cultural norms approach into an "integrated model of media effects" (p. 251). They presented a tripartite model that emphasizes interdependence among society, the media, and the individual as an audience member. Media effects are viewed as dependent on the individual's relationship with the media and society, as well as the condition of society. For example, the model predicts that when a high degree of change and conflict is present in society, "dependence on media information resources is intensified" (p. 241). Also,

> The greater the need, and consequently the stronger the dependency . . . the greater the likelihood that the information supplied will alter various forms of audience cognitions, feelings, and behavior. (p. 241)

In summary, modern approaches to mass media effects have placed more emphasis on the receivers as active users of the media, the methodological approaches have become more sophisticated, and the

theories and models of communication have become more complex than in the early days of mass communication research. The result has been explanations that account for more factors in the communication process.

Severin and Tankard (1979) assert that the field of mass communication is entering a period when theorists will conclude that the media have a strong influence on the audience. They cite successful media information campaigns as evidence for a "powerful effects" model of mass communication. The following section discusses a number of studies that have contributed to that line of thinking.

Media Information Campaigns

Now that an overview of approaches to mass communication effects has been presented, a number of research studies that investigated the effectiveness of media information campaigns are reviewed. Atkin (1981) distinguished between information and persuasion campaigns. Persuasion campaigns are designed for commercial or political purposes. Information campaigns are intended to benefit individuals or society as a whole by presenting information "designed to teach audiences more appropriate patterns of behavior" (p. 265). Commenting on their effectiveness, Atkin (1981) stated that:

> mass media information campaigns can be moderately successful under certain conditions; the key issues involve defining criteria for success, distinguishing various types of effects, and identifying the maximizing conditions for impact. (pp. 266-267)

Examples of successful campaigns are those reported by Mendelsohn (1973) on safe driving; Maccoby, Farquhar, Wood, and Alexander (1977)

on reducing heart disease risk; McAlister, Puska, Koskela, Pallonen, and Maccoby (1980) on modifying smoking behaviors; Douglas, Westley, and Chaffee (1970) and Baran (1977) on changing attitudes toward mental retardation; Haefner (1976) on hiring the disadvantaged, and others. Three of the above studies are discussed in greater detail below.

The first study was conducted by Douglas, Westley, and Chaffee (1970). It was a field experiment on knowledge and attitudes toward mental retardation, conducted in two Wisconsin towns with populations between 4,300 and 4,800. One town, designated as the experimental community, received a six-month media campaign designed to improve attitudes and knowledge about mental retardation. The campaign included 20 news stories, five newspaper feature articles, a mental retardation week advertisement, posters in local businesses, numerous radio spots, items in church bulletins, speakers at three service clubs, a 4-H Club meeting presentation, a meeting on mental retardation in a church, and a store display of articles made by mentally retarded persons. The second town served as a control group. Pre and post measures of knowledge and attitudes were taken six months apart in both towns in randomly chosen homes. There were 85 experimental subjects and 60 control subjects. Statistically significant changes in attitudes toward retardation were reported in the experimental community, while no significant changes were observed in the control community. There were no significant changes in knowledge level in either the experimental community or the control community. This study supported the idea that a media campaign of a social issue can have an impact on attitudes of the receivers.

The second study, published by Farquhar, Maccoby, Wood, Alexander, Breitrose, Brown, Haskell, McAlister, Meyer, Nash, and Stern (1977), Maccoby and Farquhar (1975), and Maccoby et al. (1977), was also a field experiment, conducted in three northern California communities with populations between 12,500 and 14,800. The purpose of the study was to determine "whether community health education can reduce the risk of cardiovascular disease . . ." (Farquhar et al., 1977, p. 1192). Two of the three communities were given a media campaign that included 50 television spots, three hours of television programming, over 100 radio spots, several hours of radio programming, weekly newspaper columns, newspaper advertisements, newspaper stories, billboards, posters, and printed materials mailed to the subjects. The mass media campaign lasted nine months during the first year, followed by a three-month period of measurement. During the second year another nine-month campaign was launched, with measures again taken during the last three months of the year. Persons in the second community who were determined as high risk for heart disease (by the Cornfield Scale of Cardiovascular Risk) were also given individual and group counseling on how to reduce cardiovascular risk. This community was designated the "media-plus-counseling" group. The third community, which was isolated from the media that reached the other two, was a control group. The dependent variables measured in the study included knowledge of risk factors, saturated fat intake, number of cigarettes smoked per day, plasma-cholesterol, systolic blood pressure, multiple logistic function of risk, and the Cornfield Scale of Cardiovascular Risk. All of the above measures were taken in all three communities at

the beginning of the study. By the end of the first year, the heart disease risk in the control group had increased 8%, while the media-only group decreased 5% in risk and the media-plus-counseling group's risk decreased 13%. During the second year the control group's risk decreased 1%, while the media-only group decreased an additional 13%. The media-plus-counseling group decreased in risk by an additional 5%. By the end of two years, there was no significant difference between the media-only group and the media-plus-counseling group. Both groups decreased in risk significantly more than the control group. Thus, the Maccoby and Farquhar study reportedly demonstrated that the mass media can be as effective as media-plus-counseling in reducing the risk of heart disease.

The third study that has important implications for this study of divorce adjustment was conducted by McAlister et al. (1980). They launched a nationwide campaign in Finland to promote cessation of smoking. The mass media campaign consisted of seven 45-minute televised group counseling sessions with 10 smokers. The campaign was broadcast on Finnish television over a month-long period. The campaign was first promoted through personal letters, newspaper articles, radio announcements, promotions in medical and nursing journals, and a national press conference. In addition, 200 volunteer leaders formed and led self-help groups that watched the television presentations and worked together to stop smoking. The campaign was evaluated by conducting two national surveys (one before and one afer the media presentation) and by studying a group of smokers for six months following the media campaign. The national survey estimated that

250,000 individuals followed at least four of the seven sessions. An estimated 80,000 to 100,000 of the 250,000 were smokers. Ten percent of the sample viewed the program with a supportive group. The panel study estimated that 1% of the smokers in Finland achieved a six-month non-smoking period. The cost effectiveness of the program was estimated at $1 for each six-month success. The authors of the study concluded:

> If media-assisted self-help is indeed an effective way of providing behavioral counseling on a large scale, the role of the behavioral science professional may shift somewhat from direct provider of treatment toward media producer. (McAlister et al., 1980, p. 378)

Conditions for Successful and Unsuccessful Media Campaigns

A number of conditions have been established as contributing to the success or failure of media information campaigns. First, media campaigns, when properly designed, can have a significant impact on the knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors of receivers. According to Atkin (1979, 1981), campaigns were generally successful when the following conditions were met: (a) The audience was sufficiently exposed to the messages. The campaign had adequate volume and repetition on communication channels and times that were readily available to the receivers. (b) The campaign was presented via television, which is the most influential medium, followed by newspapers, radio, and magazines. (c) The sources who presented the messages were trustworthy, if the goal was to change attitudes or behaviors. (d) The sources had to be expert, if the goal was to increase knowledge. (e) The attitudes, beliefs, values, social context, and behavioral patterns of the

audience were analyzed prior to the campaign. (f) Interpersonal influences on the receivers were considered when designing the campaign. The communicators knew what social forces they were competing with when attempting to influence the receivers. (g) The recipients had an intense need for the information presented. (h) The messages were presented in a clear, engaging, entertaining style. (i) Messages were presented in concentrated form, rather than over a long period of time. (j) Rational messages were used to reduce drives (e.g., provide a solution to a problem), while emotional messages were used to arouse motivation (e.g., establish a need for action). (k) Strong fear appeals were effective when realistically portrayed by a credible source who proposed a solution to the fear-arousing situation. (l) Two-sided arguments were effective when the audience was resistant or would later be exposed to the opposite point of view from that presented by the source.

Second, Atkin (1979, 1981) outlined what has been unsuccessful for campaign designers: (a) Campaigns with heavy message flow were not necessarily successful. Reaching the audience was a necessary but not sufficient condition for influencing the receivers. (b) Campaigns failed when presented in marginal time slots or on unpopular media (such as educational television or pamphlets). (c) Lengthy, technically worded programs were tuned out by receivers. (d) Campaigns failed when they called for vague, poorly defined responses from receivers. (e) Highly entrenched attitudes and behaviors were difficult to change with media campaigns.

Finally, McGuire (1981) provided a framework for planning an effective information campaign. The communication campaign organizer

should review the realities of the situation, examine the ethics, survey the sociocultural situation, map the mental matrix of the target population, develop the target themes, construct the communication with the advice Atkin has given, and evaluate the effectiveness of the campaign.

Local Studies

Three studies of mass media impact have been conducted in Box Elder County, Utah, the site of this study. The first was a media usage survey conducted by Barney and Johnson (Note 2). They found that 70.8% of the 202 persons surveyed regularly received the Box Elder News and Journal, which is a locally published semi-weekly newspaper that features local news and advertising. They also reported that 37.6% of the respondents subscribed to the Ogden Standard Examiner. The Examiner is a daily newspaper published in Ogden, Utah, which is 20 miles from Box Elder County. It has a daily circulation of 50,000. Other locally produced mass media sources in the county include the Tremonton Leader-Garland Times, and AM-FM radio station KBUH. Barney and Johnson reported that 5.4% of those surveyed subscribed to the Tremonton Leader-Garland Times, and that 8.9% indicated KBUH as the station they listened to "most often."

The second media study in Box Elder County was conducted by the experimenter to determine the audience size of a weekly newspaper column appearing in the Box Elder News and Journal and a weekly 30-minute radio show presented on KBUH. Both media presentations had been running for over a year, were on various family life themes, and

were produced by the experimenter. Telephone interviews were conducted with 156 Box Elder County residents whose names were randomly selected from the telephone directory. The respondents were read a list of local media features and asked whether they had read or heard them. Included in the list were the weekly newspaper column and radio show. Fourteen percent responded that they had heard the radio show only, and 18% said they had read the newspaper column only. Ten percent said they had both heard the show and read the column. Thus, a total of 42% of those surveyed were apparently attending to the local media efforts by the experimenter. It was concluded that the mass media education efforts were reaching a substantial number of the local citizens.

The final local study was conducted to analyze the impact of a three-media event on the subject of agoraphobia (fear of public places). During a two-week period, three mass media presentations were made. The first was a CBS television "60 Minutes" presentation, which lasted approximately 20 minutes. The second was a 25-minute radio discussion of agoraphobia, produced by the experimenter on KBUH. The third was a newspaper column on agoraphobia presented in the Box Elder News and Journal. Fifty names were randomly drawn from the local telephone directory and 50 interviews were conducted by telephone. It was found that 20% of the respondents had read the newspaper column only, 12% had viewed the television presentation only, and 2% had heard the radio show only. No one reported attending to more than one presentation. Thus, 34% of the persons surveyed apparently attended to one segment of a three-media presentation. The largest group reportedly read the local newspaper column.

The results of these three local studies show that the residents of Box Elder County are attending to both local and regional media efforts. Those findings provided a foundation for the decision to conduct a mass media campaign in Box Elder County to promote divorce adjustment.

Summary of Implications

In summary, the following ideas from the review of literature had direct bearing on the development of this study. (a) The most frequently documented emotional effects of divorce are depression, anxiety, hostility, and attachment to the ex-spouse. (b) Divorce adjustment is related to having had an active role in the decision to divorce and being able to form a new support system. (c) Most divorced persons seek help for divorce recovery. They turn to friends, counselors, and family members for assistance. (d) Divorce adjustment is apparently the most difficult during the first year. On the average, emotional recovery from divorce takes two years for men and three years for women. (e) Reviewers and researchers in the field of prevention advocate the use of mass media techniques for preventive efforts. (f) Hollister's stressor-strens model of preventive intervention can be effectively applied to divorce adjustment. Divorced persons can be taught to maximize strens and manage the emotional stresses associated with divorce. (g) The health-related mass communication literature concluded that media campaigns can successfully change attitudes and behaviors, provided the right conditions are met. They include using a credible source, adapting to

the needs of the audience, presenting an appealing message on an effective medium at an accessible time, and using a two-sided approach that includes realistic fear appeals. (h) Research conducted in the locale chosen for this study has demonstrated that the residents have been responsive to the local and regional mass media as well as to the previous media efforts of the experimenter.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Chapter III details the methodology utilized in this study. The major topics include the research design, the subjects, the mass media prevention campaign, the data and instrumentation, and the statistical analyses.

Design

The hypotheses of this study were tested by conducting a field experiment with divorced persons in a western rural community. A separate design was used to test each of the two hypotheses. The first hypothesis, which stated that divorced persons who receive a media-promoting newsletter will utilize more media events than divorced persons who do not receive a newsletter, was tested with a "posttest-only control group design" (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, p. 25). The design included one independent variable (newsletter involvement) which had two values (newsletter vs. no newsletter). The subjects were randomly assigned to either the newsletter or no newsletter condition. Those in the newsletter condition received a three-page letter promoting divorce-related radio shows, newspaper articles, and books. Those in the no newsletter condition did not receive the letter. At the end of a five-week locally produced mass media campaign, the subjects in both the newsletter and no newsletter conditions were interviewed. The interviewer did not know which experimental condition each subject was in at the time of the interview, thus eliminating a possible source of

interviewer bias. The number of media events the subjects reported utilizing was recorded, and that became the dependent variable of the study. The posttest-only control group design was chosen to test hypothesis 1 because it is a true experimental design and offered many internal validity advantages, including control of pretest sensitization and statistical regression.

Hypothesis 2, which stated that divorced persons who utilize a mass media campaign will report greater positive emotional changes than persons who do not use a media campaign, was tested with a "nonequivalent control group design." Campbell and Stanley (1963) stated that while this design is weaker than most true experimental designs, it

> does provide information which in many instances would rule out the hypothesis that X has an effect. The control group, even if widely divergent in method of recruitment and in mean level, assists in the interpretation. (p. 50)

The same subjects were utilized to test both hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2. Since the subjects in design 2 could not be randomly assigned to utilize or not utilize the media campaign, the experimenter had to wait until the end of the campaign and determine whether each subject reported using the campaign. Thus, the independent variable (reported use of media campaign) was a "self-selected" variable, which it is legitimate to use in quasi-experimental designs (see Campbell & Stanley, 1963). The subjects were divided into two media use groups: light users (those who reported utilizing two or fewer media events) and heavy users (those who reported using three or more events). After

the media campaign was completed and the reported media use for each subject had been determined, the dependent variables (attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility) were measured by having each subject complete a questionnaire. Since a nonequivalent control group design was used and the subjects were not randomly assigned to treatment conditions, the "posttest only" measurement method utilized in the first design was inappropriate to use. A pretest-posttest design was originally considered for the test of hypothesis 2. However, the anticipated difficulty in locating the subjects twice made the experimenter seek a more efficient means of testing the hypothesis. An innovative method of measurement mentioned by Campbell and Stanley (1963) and further developed by Howard, Ralph, Gulanick, Maxwell, Nance, and Gerber (1979) was utilized to strengthen the design and add efficiency to the data collection process. Called the "then/post" or "retrospective pretest," this method asks the subjects to respond first with present reactions on a posttest, then to respond as they would have reacted prior to the experimental manipulation. The authors reported a series of experiments that compared the use of traditional pretest/posttest procedures with then/post methods. After administering a variety of measures (e.g., dogmatism, assertiveness, self-expressiveness, and the Helping Questionnaire) in different settings with varied subjects, they found the then/post procedure more sensitive to actual changes with the above self-report measures than the pre/post method. Therefore, the then/post method was adopted for this study. The subjects were first asked to rate their attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility at the end of the media campaign. Then they

were asked to rate those same emotional states as they remembered them five weeks before.

Subjects

Target Population

The target population for this study was recently divorced (less than one year) persons living in a rural area. It was reasoned that in rural areas, where self-help divorce groups and other varieties of services are limited (see Wedel, 1969; or Jeffrey & Reeve, 1978), and where families and other natural support systems sometimes have difficulty dealing with marital breakup, divorced persons would stand to benefit from a mass media campaign designed to promote relief. The area chosen to conduct the study was Box Elder County, Utah. This site was chosen because the experimenter had ready access to the mass media in the area and had been writing newspaper articles and producing radio shows in the county weekly for more than two years. It was also concluded that Box Elder County was not significantly different from many other rural areas in the United States. Many of the characteristics of rural areas--reliance on one or two major industries, predominance of one religion, simple organizational structure, limited services, and lack of a minority population (see Jeffrey & Reeve, 1978)--were also true of Box Elder County. In addition, Box Elder County does not differ significantly in annual divorce rate, annual marriage rate, or per capita personal income from either the State of Utah or the United States in general (see Table 1). The fact that more than 75% of the residents of Box Elder County were members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormons)

Table 1

Divorce, Marriage, and Personal Income: Box Elder County, State of Utah, and the United States

	Box Elder	Utah	U.S.A.
Divorce rate/1000 population[a]	5.1	5.3	5.2
Marriage rate/1000 population[a]	10.9	11.5	10.6
Per capita personal income[b]	$7200	$7200	$7810

[a]Utah Department of Health (1981).

[b]Brinkerhoff (1980).

was a matter of concern to the experimenter. Therefore, it was decided to analyze the results by religious affiliation to determine whether Mormon church membership was a factor in the study.

Selection and Assignment of Subjects

The subjects were selected by obtaining from the county clerk's office the names of all couples whose divorces became final in Box Elder County between June 1, 1980 and May 31, 1981. A total of 123 divorces occurred during the year chosen for study, producing a potential of 246 subjects. Each subject's name was written on a 4" X 6" card, and the cards were placed in alphabetical order. The subjects were randomly divided into two groups that were stratified in two ways. First, equal numbers of males and females were assigned to each group, to insure equal representation of the sexes in the two experimental groups. Second, each divorced couple was divided and assigned to

opposite groups. This procedure helped balance the two groups for such variables as length of marriage, number of children in the marriage, socioeconomic status before the divorce, and age. Assignment to groups was accomplished by using a table of random numbers to assign one member of the first divorced couple (in this case, the ex-wife) to group 1 and the other member (the ex-husband) to group 2. The process was switched for the second divorced couple. The ex-husband was assigned to group 1, and the ex-wife was assigned to group 2. This method of alternating assignment to groups by sex was used until all 123 divorced couples were divided into two groups. Using a table of random numbers, group 1 was assigned as the experimental group and received the media promoting newsletter. Group 2 was assigned to be the control group and did not receive the newsletter.

Locating the Subjects

The success of this study depended to a great degree on the experimenter's ability to locate and interview the 246 divorced persons selected for the study. During the process of finding the potential subjects, it was noted that divorce is highly disruptive to human lives. The primary indicator of that disruption was the difficulty encountered finding the divorced persons. At least one member of the divorced couple normally moves to a new residence. Many remarry. Some women change back to their maiden names. Many obtain unlisted telephone numbers, while others do not obtain telephone service in their new residences. Many move back into their parents' homes.

Since the subjects were highly mobile and difficult to locate, the following steps were taken to locate them: when the names were

obtained from the county clerk's office, each public divorce decree was carefully read for clues to the person's whereabouts. Current addresses, telephone numbers, names of relatives, and addresses of properties were recorded to aid the search. The second step was to consult telephone directories in the county for the past two years. This produced additional addresses and telephone numbers. Third, telephone information service was called for names for whom no information had been found. This step yielded several new telephone listings, but no addresses. The telephone company's policy is not to release addresses. Fourth, a local utility company allowed the experimenter to examine its billing list to find current addresses of those persons who had not been located. This yielded a few additional addresses. Fifth, when it was judged appropriate, ex-spouses were asked to supply addresses for subjects who had not been located. Finally, when subjects were not found at home, the experimenter often called at the residence next door to verify that the correct address had been obtained for the subject. This yielded many new addresses for subjects that would otherwise have been lost for the study.

The above procedures produced the following results: three (1.2%) subjects refused to participate, 51 (20.7%) reportedly moved from the county prior to the beginning of the study, 91 (37.0%) could not be located by the experimenter, and 101 (41.1%) were located and interviewed. It is possible that a substantial proportion of the 91 missing subjects had also moved out of the county, since their names did not appear in the telephone company's listings nor in the utility company's billing list. Many may have been living with parents

or friends, and a substantial number of the missing females may have been remarried. At any rate, the experimenter was satisfied that every available and appropriate means to find the subjects was exhausted.

Ethical Considerations

While this study was designed to provide help for the subjects, and no harmful side effects were foreseen, the investigator was nonetheless keenly aware of the ethical obligation to the persons involved. According to the ethical principles of the American Psychological Association (1981), the researcher must assume responsibility for the welfare of all research subjects.

The experimenter began by observing the principle of informed consent. Each subject was told that the experimenter was a student at Utah State University, conducting research on media use with divorced persons. Each subject was given a choice regarding participation in the study. Those who refused were politely thanked and not contacted further.

Since the study administered a diagnostic psychological test (the Symptom Check List 90-R), the issue of confidentiality was also important. The investigator employed the following safeguards to insure confidentiality of the subjects' responses to the questionnaires: first, the subjects' names were never placed on the test protocols or questionnaires used in the study. Each subject was represented by a code number, which was placed on the testing materials. Second, all test protocols were placed in a locked file at the Mental Health Center and were never shown to anyone. In addition,

the results of the study are reported in the form of group statistics. No individual results are reported, displayed, or referred to anywhere in the study.

Finally, the issue of responsibility was observed as follows. Since the investigator encountered many persons in the study who were lonely and whose social and sexual lives had been disrupted, he attempted to safeguard the reputations of those involved by interviewing females only with other family members in the house, on the front porch of the residence, or when accompanied by a female research assistant.

Mass Media Campaign

Objectives and Audience Analysis

The purpose of the media campaign was to help divorced persons cope with the stresses common to divorced life. The messages were designed to (a) help divorced persons realize that many other divorced persons are experiencing similar loneliness, depression, disappointments, etc., (b) help them think of new solutions to their problems of parenting, social stigma, and family pressures, and (c) encourage them to continue to solve their problems.

Atkin (1979) suggested that audience analysis is a necessary part of any successful media campaign. The media campaign designed for this study utilized two sources of information for audience analysis. First, the demographics of the local area were considered and incorporated into the planning (Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 1979). Box Elder County is a rural area with a population density of

5.8 persons per square mile. Agricultural employment comprises approximately 10% of the work force. Thiokol Chemical, a manufacturer of aerospace products, employs 20% of the work force. The residents are well educated. Nearly three-fourths have completed high school and over 12% have completed four or more years of college. The racial breakdown is 95% White, 2% Spanish-American, 2% American Indian, and 1% Asian-American. The residents are religiously oriented, with more than three-fourths being members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. The characteristics observed in Box Elder County, i.e., low population density, reliance on one major employer, predominance of the white race, and a majority holding membership in one church, are typical of rural areas (see, for example, Jeffrey & Reeve, 1978; or Wedel, 1969). Thus, the key ideas gained from the audience analysis were that the listeners/readers would likely be oriented toward rural values, employed in agriculture or manufacturing, white, well educated, religious, and with an average income. The second source utilized for the audience analysis was the literature on the characteristics of divorced persons. According to the ideas presented by Kitson and Raschke (1981) and Bloom et al. (1978), the target persons for the media campaign would likely be experiencing depression, anxiety, hostility, loneliness, failure, guilt, frustration in dealing with children, and a lingering attachment to the ex-spouse. They would likely be socially isolated, having difficulty relating to former friends, and alienated from family members. They would likely have a higher incidence of mental illness, alcoholism, medical problems, and attempted suicides than the general population. In summary, there was

a high probability that the intended audience for the media campaign would be in a state of crisis and would be receptive to messages designed to help them overcome their difficulties.

Campaign Strategy

Flay and Cook (1981) stated that large-scale experiments on media campaigns can be justified, provided the messages are likely to be attended to by the audience, and will likely have an effect. Otherwise, the campaign and research efforts will be a waste of valuable resources. Previous studies in Box Elder County indicated that 42% of the county's residents reported using the media events produced by the experimenter. Thus, there was sufficient justification for conducting and researching a campaign in the target area. This section describes the rationale and procedures for developing the campaign, including the media used, the newsletter, the length of the campaign, and the procedures for pretesting the messages used in the campaign.

Media. Since previous studies had determined that newspapers are a major source of information for most Box Elder County residents (see review of literature), it was decided to utilize the available newspapers in Box Elder County area. Editors of the Box Elder News and Journal, Tremonton Leader, and Ogden Standard Examiner were contacted and asked to participate in the campaign. They agreed to print the articles presented during the time frame requested by the experimenter. A total of 16 newspaper articles appeared during the campaign. Thirteen were feature stories written by the experimenter, two were news articles written by the experimenter, and one was an editorial written by the editor of the Box Elder News and Journal on the trauma

of divorce. The topics chosen for the newspaper articles were patterned after the five areas of divorce adjustment proposed by Pais and White (1979): emotional, co-parental, legal, economic, and social. The topics of the articles were the cycle of divorce, dealing with the ex-spouse, dealing with the children, dealing with friends and family, myths of divorce, the emotional effects of divorce, building an effective support system, legal aspects of divorce, divorce and religion, handling finances after divorce, and building a future after divorce. Copies of the messages used in the campaign are displayed in Appendix A.

Radio was also an important part of the media campaign. The experimenter produced 10 semi-weekly 25-minute radio shows on divorce adjustment. Five of the shows were presented by the experimenter alone. The topics presented were the cycle of divorce, dealing with the ex-spouse, dealing with the children, dealing with friends and family members, and building a future after divorce. The five remaining shows were interviews. The first was with a divorced man and woman. The second interviewed a banker on how to handle finances when divorced. The third was with an attorney on post-divorce legal problems. The fourth and fifth shows were interviews with local religious leaders. One was with a Baptist pastor who conducts groups for divorced, widowed, and single adults. The other was a member of a stake presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints who has a Ph.D. in counseling plus experience counseling divorced persons. Each of the 10 shows was presented on station KBUH, a 1000-watt AM/FM radio station in Brigham City, Utah. In addition to the 10 shows, 50+

one-minute radio spots on divorce recovery were aired during the five-week media campaign.

Atkin (1979) advised that television is the most effective medium to use in a health-related campaign. However, local television programming was not available to the experimenter. Thus, pre-existing programming had to be utilized. In order to determine what television programming on divorce could be included in the media campaign, contacts were made with television program directors in Salt Lake City and New York City. Twenty-nine divorce-related television programs were aired during the five-week campaign period. A series of four programs was presented during the last two weeks of the campaign, titled "Mr. Rogers Talks with Parents and Children About Divorce." Also, 25 episodes of "One Day at a Time," a situation comedy about a divorced family, were aired during the five-week period.

Other media included in the campaign were books and magazines. The local library and bookstores were surveyed for worthwhile books on divorce adjustment. Those books judged as helpful were promoted in the newsletter sent to the experimental group. Also, the latest issues of dozens of popular magazines (e.g., Ladies Home Journal, McCalls, and Redbook) were surveyed prior to and during the media campaign. However, no helpful articles on divorce were found that would be timely for the campaign. Therefore, magazines were not mentioned in the newsletter.

Newsletter. The mass media prevention campaign was promoted with the experimental group by sending each subject a newsletter outlining the media events during the five-week campaign. It included a schedule

of radio shows, a list of recommended books on divorce recovery, a list of newspaper articles to be published, and a proclamation from the mayor of Brigham City. He declared July as "divorce recovery month" and wished divorced persons a speedy recovery. The newsletter was mailed to 96 persons in the experimental group for whom addresses were available on June 25, 1981. Sixteen were returned by the post office as not deliverable. Thus, 80 newsletters potentially reached the subjects in the experimental group. See Appendix B for a copy of the newsletter.

Length. Two sources were consulted for advice on length of the campaign. First, previous successful mass media campaigns ranged in length from the two-year heart disease prevention effort by Maccoby and Farquhar (1975) to the one-hour "National Drivers' Test" by Mendelsohn (1973). No guidelines concerning length were available from the research studies on media campaigns.

The field of advertising was also consulted for advice on how long to run the media campaign. Atkin (1979) warned that positive results can be reversed when audiences are exposed to a lengthy campaign. Ostheimer (1970) and Ray, Sawyer, and Strong (1971) conducted studies on lengths of advertising campaigns. They found that brand preference, recall, and brand mention reached an optimal level between four and six weeks after the start of a campaign, then diminished in effectiveness. Ray et al. (1971) concluded that brand preference "takes the form of an increase over the first six exposure groups and a gradual negative trend in the weeks following" (p. 15). While the media campaign planned for this study was in many ways different from an advertising

campaign, the advertising research provided the only practical guidelines available for planning the length of a media campaign. Therefore, it was decided to conduct the media campaign for five weeks.

Message evaluations. After the divorce adjustment messages were constructed, a sample of the messages was evaluated by two groups. Two written messages (prepared for newspaper publication) and two tape-recorded messages (prepared for radio broadcast) were presented to a group of experts for evaluation. The group consisted of three Ph.D. psychologists and one D.S.W. social worker, all of whom were practicing psychotherapy in Box Elder County. The group members' years of experience dealing with divorce-related problems ranged from two to 10. Each expert judge listened to two tapes, read two messages, and completed a rating form on each. The possible range of ratings was from 1 to 6, with 1 the most negative evaluation possible and 6 the most positive possible. A mean rating for each message was obtained from each judge, and the means were calculated across judges for each message. The results of the judges' ratings on the four messages are presented in Table 2. The high ratings (all above 5) indicate that, in the opinion of the expert judges, the messages would positively influence the adjustment of divorced persons in Box Elder County. A copy of the rating scales used is presented in Appendix C.

The messages were also evaluated by a group of four divorced persons who live in Box Elder County, but were not in the sample chosen for the study. The group listened to one taped message, read one written message, and rated the messages on scales similar to those used by the expert judges. Appendix D contains a copy of the scales used.

The results, shown in Table 2, indicate that the divorced persons also rated the messages positively in all areas. Thus, from the ratings of both the expert judges and the divorced persons, it was concluded that the messages would likely promote adjustment to divorce.

Table 2

Ratings of Messages by Judges and Divorced Persons

Group	N	Message	Medium	Mean rating
Expert judges	4	A	Taped	5.59
Divorced persons	4	A	Taped	5.54
Expert judges	3	B	Written	5.89
Divorced persons	3	B	Written	5.45
Expert judges	4	C	Taped	5.75
Expert judges	4	D	Written	5.96

In summary, the prevention program for this study was a five-week media campaign on adjustment to divorce that consisted of 16 newspaper articles, 10 radio shows, 50+ radio spot announcements, and 29 television shows. A newsletter was sent to 96 divorced persons in order to promote the media campaign. The campaign was pretested with both expert judges and divorced persons and was rated excellent by both groups.

Data and Instrumentation

Four areas of measurement were utilized in this study, including demographic characteristics of the sample, utilization of the mass media campaign, attachment to the ex-spouse, and emotional adjustment to divorce. The following sections describe the instruments used to measure these variables.

Demographic Characteristics

A number of demographic and divorce-related variables were measured in the study. They included age, sex, current marital status, religious preference, number of children, number of children in the subject's custody, number of confidants available to talk about the divorce, number of hours spent with those confidants during the past month, number of counseling sessions since the divorce, attitude toward the divorce, family's attitude toward the divorce, length of the divorce, the partner who initially suggested the divorce, length of the marriage, and the family's attitude toward the marriage. These variables were measured partially by a personal interview and partially by a questionnaire completed by the subjects. Appendix E presents the measure used to obtain the demographic information.

Utilization of the Campaign

The major dependent variable of the study, reported utilization of the mass media divorce adjustment campaign, was measured by asking: "During the month of July, how many (radio shows, television shows, newspaper articles, magazine articles, books) did you (listen to, watch, read) about divorce?" In order to verify and check on the validity of the results, the interviewer followed each positive answer with a follow-up question to secure more information about the media activities of the subject. For example, if a subject answered, "I read all the articles that came out in the paper a few weeks ago," the interviewer then asked "Do you recall which newspaper?" and "Do you recall any of the ideas from the articles?" If the subject was able to give the name of the newspaper and some idea concerning the content of

the articles, media use was scored positively. The media use score for each subject was determined by totaling the number of media events about divorce the subject reported utilizing during the campaign. A second media-related variable measured whether each subject had received the newsletter sent to the experimental group. Each subject was asked the following: "During the last week of June, did you receive a newsletter about divorce recovery?" The subject's positive or negative response was recorded and later compared with the record of whether a newsletter was sent to that subject. Subjects were included in the "newsletter" condition only when they verified that they had received the newsletter.

Attachment to Ex-Spouse

Weiss (1976) characterized attachment as a persistent bonding to the ex-spouse that continues even after most other feelings have diminished. Brown et al. (1980) developed a measure of attachment composed of five items that "describe the degree to which the respondent reports being emotionally attached to the spouse" (p. 308). The possible scores on the test range from 5 to 13, with 5 representing minimal attachment and 13 indicating a high degree of attachment. Brown et al. (1980) reported an alpha reliability coefficient of .80 for their measure of attachment. The Brown measure of attachment was utilized in this study. Each subject was administered the five attachment questions in both posttest and retrospective pretest form. A copy of the attachment measure is presented in Appendix F. The alpha coefficient, used to estimate reliability for one-sample, multiple scored items (Anastasi, 1976), was calculated for the pretest and

posttest attachment results, and the Kuder-Richardson formula was used for estimating reliability of the change scores. Reliabilities for the posttest, retrospective pretest, and change scores are presented in Table 3. It was concluded that the attachment measure had produced an acceptable degree of reliability.

Table 3

Reliability Results for Measures of Attachment, Depression, Anxiety, and Hostility

Measure	Posttest reliability	Retrospective pretest	Change scores
Attachment	.61	.61	.76
Depression	.93	.94	.98
Anxiety	.94	.93	.97
Hostility	.89	.88	.97
Reported media use	.92		

Emotional Adjustment to Divorce

The review of literature established that three emotional reactions commonly associated with divorce are depression, anxiety, and hostility (see Bloom et al., 1978; or Hackney & Ribordy, 1980). The Symptom Check List 90-Revised (SCL-90-R) was used to measure depression, anxiety, and hostility for this study. The SCL-90-R is a multidimensional self-report inventory developed by Derogatis (1977). It consists of 90 statements concerning the emotional state of the respondent. It measures the degree of intensity of emotional problems on nine dimensions: somatization, obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation, and psychoticism. The SCL-90-R met several requirements that

were necessary for this study. First, it is a relatively brief measure that can be administered quickly with little detailed explanations necessary. Second, it includes the three emotional dimensions chosen for this study (depression, anxiety, and hostility). Third, previous testing on the SCL-90-R has produced convincing reliability and validity data. For the purposes of this study, only the scales of depression, anxiety, and hostility were measured. Appendix G presents a copy of the SCL-90-R.

The SCL-90-R was tested for reliability by Derogatis. The alpha coefficients for internal consistency reported by Derogatis for the depression, anxiety, and hostility scales were .90, .85, and .84 respectively. The test-retest coefficients reported for depression, anxiety, and hostility were .82, .80, and .80 respectively. The reliability of the SCL-90-R results obtained for this research study were estimated, using the alpha coefficient and the Kuder-Richardson formula. The reliability results are presented in Table 3 and ranged from .88 to .98. It was concluded that the SCL-90-R results of this study produced a high degree of reliability.

The validity of the SCL-90-R has been estimated on several dimensions, including factorial invariance, concurrent validity, discriminative validity, and construct validity. Derogatis defined factorial invariance as "constancy in composition of a dimension as one moves across significant subject parameters such as age, sex, or social class" (p. 16). His investigation of invariance on the SCL-90-R between males and females produced invariance coefficients of .84, .60, and .85 for the depression, anxiety, and hostility scales respectively.

Concurrent validity of the SCL-90-R was estimated by comparing it with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Correlations between the SCL-90-R and corresponding MMPI scales ranged from .41 to .75. The discriminative ability of the SCL-90-R was found to be "excellent" in studies of cancer patients, drug abusers, resignees from a military academy for cheating, persons with sexual disorders, and surgery patients with depression. The construct validity of the SCL-90-R was tested by Derogatis and Cleary (1977), using the principal components method of factor analysis. They concluded that "all nine symptom constructs showed at least moderate levels of theoretical-empirical agreement" (p. 988). Thus, it was concluded that research on the SCL-90-R had produced convincing evidence of reliability and validity, making it a useful tool to measure depression, anxiety, and hostility for this study.

Data Analysis

The results from each questionnaire and interview schedule were coded and punched onto 80-column computer cards for automated analysis. The depression, anxiety, and hostility scores from the SCL-90-R were converted to *t* scores, with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. The conversions were produced by referring to a table of standards established by Derogatis (1977) on a non-psychiatric population. Descriptive and inferential statistics were calculated utilizing the VAX computer and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975) at the Utah State University Computer Center.

Before the data analysis began, the experimenter considered whether to use parametric or nonparametric methods for statistical analysis. Traditionally, the decision has been based on whether the data meet assumptions such as interval or ratio data, homogeneity of variance, normal distribution of scores, random selection of subjects, and random assignment to treatment conditions (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1979). However, social science researchers have recently investigated the relative effects of violating the above assumptions. As a result, many experts have advocated using parametric statistics, even when the assumptions cannot be fully met (see, for example, Anderson, 1972; Boneau, 1972; or Labovitz, 1967). They have emphasized that valuable information can be lost when distribution-free methods are used for analysis. In summary, parametric statistical methods can be safely employed when the following conditions are met: (a) the number of observations in each cell is greater than 15 (Boneau, 1960), (b) the distributions of the various comparison groups are similar, even though they may be skewed (Boneau, 1960), and (c) the number of observations in each cell is equal (Boneau, 1960; Dretzke, Levin, & Serlin, 1982; Glass, Peckham, & Sanders, 1972). Even when the numbers of observations in the cells are unequal and the variances are heterogeneous, data transformations, separate variance formulas, and increases in the number of observations can be used to avoid gross violations of the assumptions underlying parametric statistics.

For the purposes of this study, it was decided to proceed with parametric statistics, with the following precautionary measures: the number of observations in each cell was kept high and as equal as

possible. The F-Max test for homogeneity of variance was calculated for all variables included in the hypothesis tests (Winer, 1962). When heterogeneity of variance was found, a separate variances adaptation of the t test was used to test the hypothesis (Nie et al., 1975). The homogeneity of variance results for each variable are presented along with the t-test results in the next chapter.

Reliability of measurement for this study was estimated by two methods. The posttest and retrospective pretest scores for attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility were tested for reliability with the alpha coefficient (Anastasi, 1976). The emotional change and media use scores were tested for reliability with a special adaptation of the Kuder-Richardson formula.[1] The formula is presented below.

$$\underline{r} = \frac{n}{n-1} \left[\frac{\overline{X}(n-\overline{X})}{ns_X^2} \right]$$

where r = the reliability coefficient, n = the total number of possible points on the measure, $\overline{X}$ = the observed mean of the measure, and s_X^2 = the observed variance of the measure. This formula was used to estimate reliability for reported media use, attachment change scores, depression change scores, anxiety change scores, and hostility change scores. The reliability results are presented in Table 3.

Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis 1 was tested by comparing the experimental group with the control group on reported utilization of the media campaign. The

---

[1]The formula was obtained from Dr. James Shaver, Professor of Education at Utah State University, who reportedly verified the formula through personal correspondence with Dr. L. J. Cronbach.

t test for independent samples was used to determine the significance of the observed differences between the means (Winer, 1962). Since hypothesis 1 was directional (i.e., it predicted greater reported media use in the experimental group than in the control), a one-tailed test of significance was employed (Hinkle et al., 1979). The alpha level for testing hypothesis 1 was set at .05.

Hypothesis 2 was tested by comparing the light reported media use group with the heavy reported media use group on reported changes in attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility. Howard et al. (1979, pp. 20-21) recommended that when using a retrospective pretest, posttest design, the researcher should calculate the difference between scores on the retrospective pretest and the posttest for each subject, then apply statistical analyses to the change scores. That procedure was utilized for this study. Once the change scores were obtained and tested for reliability (Table 3) and homogeneity of variance, they were submitted to a *t* test for significance of difference between independent means (Winer, 1962). Since hypothesis 2 was directional, a one-tailed test of significance was used (Hinkle et al., 1979). The alpha level for hypothesis 2 was also set at .05.

Additional Analyses

A number of demographic and divorce-related variables were measured in this study. The researcher was interested in the relationships among those variables, as well as how they related to the independent and dependent variables of the study. Therefore, a number of supplementary analyses were completed. First, the dependent variables of the study (reported media use, attachment change,

depression change, anxiety change, and hostility change) were analyzed in several comparison groups, including sex, age, marital status, use of psychotherapy, person who filed for divorce, use of local media, religious affiliation, availability of confidants, and time spent with confidants. The *t* test was used when two groups were compared, and a one-way analysis of variance was used when three or more groups were involved. Since no *a priori* predictions were made for these additioal analyses, two-tailed tests of significance were employed (Hinkle et al., 1979). Second, a 2 x 2 analysis of variance was calculated with two independent variables: light vs. heavy reported media use, and time spent vs. time not spent with confidants. The purpose of this analysis was to observe possible interactions between reported media use and time with confidants. Third, correlations were calculated among all major variables in the study. Where the data were continuous and had produced equal-appearing intervals, the Pearson product-moment method of correlation was used (Hinkle et al., 1979). When continuous variables were correlated with discrete variables, the point-biserial coefficient was used. The results of these analyses are presented in the following chapter.

Finally, a number of other statistical tests and presentations were prepared as aids for helping the reader further understand the findings of the study. The results of those tests are presented in connection with the hypothesis test results and include the following: (a) an analysis of covariance (Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973) with reported media use as the independent variable, emotional change scores as the dependent variables, and length of marriage, length of divorce,

attitude toward the divorce, and pretest emotional scores as the covariates; (b) an analysis of covariance with reported media use as the independent variable, posttest emotional scores as the dependent variable, and pretest emotional scores as the covariate; (c) frequency distribution tables of the dependent variables (reported media use, attachment change, depression change, anxiety change, and hostility change); and (d) a non-parametric statistical analysis of hypothesis 1. Both the Mann-Whitney U and the median test (Siegel, 1956) were used to compare the experimental and control groups on median reported media use.

Since the analyses of covariance and non-parametric tests involved directional hypotheses, one-tailed interpretations of significance were employed. All other analyses were two-tailed. The .05 level of significance was set for all the additional analyses.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of this study are presented in six major divisions, including: (a) demographic characteristics and divorce-related variables; (b) reported utilization of the media campaign; (c) the test of hypothesis 1, including the t-test results, a breakdown by type of media, correlations with other variables, a frequency distribution of the results, and non-parametric statistical results; (d) the test of hypothesis 2, including overall emotional changes, emotional change differences for the reported media use groups, correlations with other variables, analysis of covariance results, and frequency distributions of the emotional change scores; (e) analyses of the major dependent variables according to sex, age, marital status, person who filed for divorce, religious preference, local media use, use of psychotherapy, availability of confidants, and time spent with confidants; and (f) a summary of the major findings.

Demographics and Divorce-Related Variables

The 101 subjects included 54 (53.5%) females and 47 (46.5%) males. The proportions of age ranges represented in the sample included 5.7% under age 20; 37.2% 20-29; 31.4% 30-39; 20.0% 40-49; and 5.7% 50 and over. The racial distribution was similar to the general population of Box Elder County, with 88.1% Caucasian, 4.9% Hispanic, 4.0% American Indian, 2.0% Oriental, and 1.0% Black. The majority (71.4%) were still divorced, while 18.6% were married to a new person, and 10.0% were remarried to their former spouses. The subjects had a

median of two children (range: 0-9), with a median of one child presently living at home (range: 0-5). The religious preferences included 68.1% Mormon, 13.0% Protestant, 4.4% Catholic, and 14.5% with no religious preference. They had been married a mean of 9.9 years prior to divorce (range: 2 months to 39 years). Over half the sample (54.3%) reported that their families had initially favored their marriages, whereas 27.1% said their families had been opposed; and 18.6% reported neutral family reactions toward their marriages.

When asked who had initiated the idea of divorce, 42.9% reported first bringing up the idea of divorce, while 35.7% reported that their spouses brought up the idea first. The remaining 21.4% said the divorce was a mutual idea. When it came to filing for divorce, 55.0% of the sample had initiated divorce proceedings, as verified by the County Clerk's Office. The majority (82.0%) of the proceedings were initiated by females.

Attitudes toward the divorce were measured, including the subjects' attitudes and the subjects' perceptions of their families' attitudes. More than half (54.3%) of the subjects were favorable toward divorcing their ex-spouses, while less than half (41.4%) of the subjects perceived that their families were favorable toward their divorce.

Utilization of the Media Campaign

One of the major objectives of this study was to determine whether recently divorced persons would make use of a divorce-related media campaign. The results showed that 78 (77.2%) of the 101 subjects interviewed reported utilizing one or more media events.

Reported media use is presented in Table 4. The results are divided into type of media utilized and local vs. national origin of media production. The 101 subjects reported utilizing a mean of 3.90 media events, 2.38 of which were locally produced (radio and newspaper presentations) and 1.52 of which were produced outside the local area (television presentations, magazine articles, and books). Newspapers were reportedly the most heavily used medium, followed in decreasing order of reported use by television, radio, magazines, and books.

Table 4

Reported Use of the Divorce Adjustment Media Campaign by Recently Divorced Persons (N = 101)

	Events utilized		
Type of media event	Mean	Median	Range
Locally produced campaign:			
Newspaper articles	1.75	0	0-10
Radio shows	.63	0	0-16
Total local events	2.38		
Nationally produced media events:			
Television shows	.97	0	0-20
Magazine articles	.36	0	0-3
Books	.19	0	0-3
Total national events	1.52		
All media events combined	3.90	2	0-25

Test of Hypothesis 1: Newsletter and Reported Media Use

The first hypothesis stated that subjects who received a media-promoting newsletter would report using more media events than subjects who did not receive a newsletter. It was tested by computing a *t* test for the difference between the reported media use means of the two groups. A one-tailed *t* test for independent samples was used (see rationale in Chapter III). In addition to the *t*-test results, this section reports a breakdown by type of media reportedly used, a frequency distribution of the reported media use data, and a non-parametric analysis of the reported media use data.

t-Test Results

The results of the *t* test between the reported media use means of the newsletter and no newsletter groups are presented in Table 5. Those who received the newsletter reported attending to 4.95 media events, while those who did not receive the newsletter reported using 3.12 events. The difference between the two means was statistically significant. The experimental group reported utilizing 58.7% more media events than the control group.

In addition to the *t* test, a point-biserial correlation was calculated between receipt of newsletter (which is a discrete variable) and reported media use (which is a continuous variable). The result was a point-biserial correlation of .18 ($p<.05$, 100 *df*, one-tailed). The correlation coefficient was then squared to determine the proportion of variance in media use associated with newsletter receipt. The results showed that 3.2% of the variance in reported media use was associated with receipt or nonreceipt of newsletter. In summary, while the common

variance for the two variables was low, the difference between the means of the two groups was in the direction predicted, and the probability that the difference between the two means was due to chance was less than 5%. Thus, limited support was found for hypothesis 1.

Table 5

Reported Media Use in the Experimental and Control Groups: Test of Hypothesis 1

Group	*n*	Utilized one or more events	$\bar{X}$ media events reported	*SD*	F_{max}	*df*	*t*[b]
Experimental (newsletter)	43	79.1%	4.95	6.22	3.02*	62.39[a]	-1.73*
Control (no newsletter)	58	75.9%	3.12	3.58			
Total	101	77.2%	3.90	4.94			

[a]Since heterogeneity of variance was found, a separate variances method was used to calculate the *t* test. The degrees of freedom were calculated according to a formula presented by Nie et al. (1975).

[b]With *df* = 62.39, $t_{.05}$ = 1.671 (one-tailed).

*$p < .05$.

Breakdown by Type of Media

In addition to overall reported media use, each mass medium (newspapers, television, radio, magazines, and books) was analyzed separately to determine whether receipt of the newsletter was associated with any particular reported media use. The results are presented in Table 6. While the means for overall reported media use were significantly different, no statistically significant differences were

Table 6

Reported Use of Newspapers, Television, Radio, Magazines, and Books by the Experimental and Control Groups

Type of media	Group	n	Mean	SD	F_{max}	df[a]	t
Newspaper	Experimental	43	2.05	2.40	1.04	99	-1.07
	Control	58	1.53	2.36			
Television	Experimental	43	1.53	4.14	13.48*	46.64	-1.52
	Control	58	.55	1.13			
Radio	Experimental	43	.86	2.60	3.09*	61.95	-.90
	Control	58	.47	1.48			
Magazines	Experimental	43	.33	.72	1.31	99	.57
	Control	58	.41	.82			
Books	Experimental	43	.23	.53	1.36	99	-.66
	Control	58	.16	.62			

[a]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point are for analyses of variables that did not meet the homogeneity of variance assumption. They were calculated according to a formula presented by Nie et al. (1975).

*$p < .05$.

found between the experimental and control groups in reported use of newspapers, television, radio, magazines, or books. Correlation coefficients were also calculated between reported use of the types of media and receipt of newsletter, as well as between reported use of types of media and total reported use. The results are shown in Table 7. The correlations between reported media use and receipt of newsletter are consistent with the t-test results. No significant relationships were found. However, when reported use of the various media were correlated with total reported media use, several significant relationships were noted. Newspapers demonstrated the strongest relationship to total reported media use, closely followed by reported television and radio use.

Table 7

Correlations Between Reported Media Use and Receipt of Newsletter

	Received newsletter or not[a]	Total reported media use[b]
Reported newspaper use[b]	.11	.69*
Reported television use[b]	.17	.66*
Reported radio use[b]	.10	.55*
Reported magazine use[b]	-.06	.30*
Reported book use[b]	.07	.15

[a]Dichotomous variable.

[b]Continuous variable.

*$p < .005$.

Frequency Distribution of Results

In order to further clarify the results of the test of hypothesis 1, the data are presented in frequency distribution form in Table 8. As noted from Table 5, the variances of the experimental and control groups were heterogeneous. Thus, the two distributions were not likely similar. The results in Table 8 show that the range of scores in the experimental group was from 0 to 25, while the range in the control group was from 0 to 17. There was a gap between 14 and 21 in the distribution of the experimental group, and there were three isolated scores between 21 and 25. It is likely that those three scores account for the heterogeneity of variance between the two groups.

Non-Parametric Statistical Results

As discussed in the analysis of data section above (see Chapter III), the decision was made to analyze the data with appropriate parametric statistical tests. However, for the reader who may have disagreed with the researcher's decision to use parametric analyses, and for the sake of illustrating differences between parametric and non-parametric analyses, two additional tests are presented. First, the data were analyzed using a Mann-Whitney U, which is recognized as the most powerful non-parametric test for analyzing differences in medians for two independent groups (Siegel, 1956). The results are presented in Table 9. As noted from the results, the difference between the two medians was not significant. Thus, hypothesis 1 was not supported by the first non-parametric analysis.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Reported Media Use by Experimental and Control Groups

Number of media events reported	Group: Experimental (Newsletter) n = 43	Group: Control (No newsletter) n = 58	Total N = 101
	f	f	f
25	1		1
24	1		1
23			
22			
21	1		1
20			
19			
18			
17		1	1
16			
15			
14	1		1
13			
12	1		1
11	2	1	3
10		3	3
9	1	1	2
8		1	1
7	2	2	4
6	2	2	4
5	4	7	11
4	2	1	3
3	4	3	7
2	8	10	18
1	4	12	16
0	9	14	23

Table 9

Mann-Whitney U Results for Reported Media Use in Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Median	n	z	One-tailed probability
Experimental	3	43	1.37	.09
Control	2	58		

Second, for the most conservative researcher, who may not believe that the reported media use data met the requirements for use of the Mann-Whitney U, the data were submitted to a Median Test (Siegel, 1956). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 10. The second non-parametric analysis was also not significant and did not support hypothesis 1. It is interesting to note that the three methods of statistical analysis used (*t* test, Mann-Whitney U, and Median Test) produced comparable probability levels (.05, .09, and .13 respectively) with the same data. Also, as the method of analysis became more powerful, the results more nearly approached significance. The Median Test was not significant ($p = .13$), while the Mann-Whitney U test approached significance ($p = .09$), and the *t* test was significant ($p<.05$).

Table 10

Median Test Results for Reported Media Use in Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Median	n	Chi-square	One-tailed probability
Experimental	3	43	1.26	.13
Control	2	58		

Test of Hypothesis 2: Media Use and Emotional Change

Hypothesis 2 predicted that subjects who reported heavy use of the media campaign would experience greater positive emotional changes than those who reported light use. Seventy subjects completed the retrospective pretest and posttest measures of attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility. The 70 were divided into two media use groups by splitting the subjects at the median score for reported media use. Thirty-five subjects were placed in the light reported media use group (two or fewer reported events), and 35 were placed in the heavy reported media use group (three or more reported events). Hypothesis 2 was tested by submitting the mean reported emotional change scores from the heavy and light reported use groups to a *t* test for independent groups. This was done for each of the emotional dimensions: attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility.

The results of the test of hypothesis 2 are presented as follows. Overall emotional changes from the retrospective pretest to the posttest are reported first. The *t*-test and correlation results that provide support or lack of support for the hypothesis are presented next. After the hypothesis tests, additional analyses are presented for the purpose of clarifying and expanding the results. They include analyses of covariance of both the posttest scores and the emotional change scores, and frequency distributions of the emotional change scores. Non-parametric analyses are not presented for the emotional change hypothesis, as they were for the test of hypothesis 1. The reason for this is that the median change score for the two reported media use groups on each emotional dimension was 0. Thus, to run a

statistical inference on differences between medians seemed pointless, when the medians were the same.

Reported Overall Emotional Changes

Before proceeding with the test of hypothesis 2, it was determined whether the subjects, taken as a total group, reported changes in emotional adjustment from the beginning of the media campaign to its end five weeks later. The degree of reported emotional change was determined by comparing the retrospective pretest means with the posttest means, using a *t* test for significance of difference between correlated groups (Winer, 1962). Also, a Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated between the pretest and posttest scores to determine the degree to which they were related. The results for reported emotional change are presented in Table 11.

The first finding to note from Table 11 is that the subjects as a group reported significantly lower emotional scores on the posttest than on the retrospective pretest. That is, the subjects apparently considered themselves to be more attached, depressed, anxious, and hostile before the media campaign than at the close of the campaign five weeks later. However, the degree of change on each of the emotional dimensions needs to be more closely examined. On the attachment measure, which has a possible range of 5 (least attached) to 13 (most attached), the subjects reported moving from 7.37 to 6.86, a change of only .51. On the depression, anxiety, and hostility measures, which are standardized with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10, the subjects reported changing approximately one-third of one standard deviation (or, from 3.38 to 3.68 points--see Table 11).

Table 11

Pre-Post Emotional Changes During the Five-Week Media Campaign for All Subjects Combined

Emotional dimension	Measure	Mean	Mean diff.	SD	F_{max}	r	df	t
Attachment	Retro-pre	7.37	-.51	2.66	1.16	.87*	69	-3.24*
	Post	6.86		2.47				
Depression	Retro-pre	59.47	-3.38	19.36	1.12	.91*	69	-3.50*
	Post	56.09		18.28				
Anxiety	Retro-pre	57.03	-3.39	19.24	1.13	.90*	69	-3.34*
	Post	53.64		18.06				
Hostility	Retro-pre	56.54	-3.68	18.11	1.09	.88*	69	-3.55*
	Post	52.86		17.36				

*$p < .005$.

A second important finding from the emotional change data is that the subjects as a group reported low to moderate degrees of attachment, depression, anxiety, or hostility. Both the pretest and posttest measures of attachment were at the low end of the range (7.37 and 6.86 on a scale of 5-13). The reported depression pretest mean was approximately one standard deviation above the mean for a normal population. The reported pretest means for anxiety and hostility were less than one standard deviation above the mean. Therefore, subjects reported changing from a moderate degree of emotional disturbance to a slight degree of disturbance.

Finally, the correlations between pretest and posttest scores on the emotional measures were strikingly high (.87 to .91). This finding, which will be discussed more fully in the next chapter, could indicate that the emotional states measured were very stable, or that the subjects gave the same answers on the retrospective pretest as they did on the posttest.

The Test of Hypothesis 2

The t-test results for the test of hypothesis 2 are presented in Table 12. The F-max test for homogeneity of variance indicated heterogeneity of variance between the two experimental groups on all the measures of emotional change. Therefore, a separate variances formula for the t test was employed for the analysis. The t-test results showed no significant difference between the reported attachment change means of the high and low reported media use groups. Also, the point-biserial correlation between media use group and attachment change was .11, which was not significant. The correlation squared showed that approximately 1% of the variance in reported attachment change was associated with media use or nonuse.

The results of the depression change hypothesis test, displayed in Table 12, indicated a significant difference between the light and heavy reported media use groups in reported depression change. The mean reported depression change was significantly greater in the heavy reported media use group than it was in the light reported media use group. There was also a significant positive correlation ($r = .20$, $p<.05$) between media use group and depression change (see Table 13). The correlation squared indicated that 4% of the variance in reported

Table 12

Emotional Change Differences for Media Use Groups: The Test of Hypothesis 2

Emotional dimension	Reported media use group	n	Mean change[a]	SD	F_{max}	df[b]	t[c]
Attachment	Light	35	-.37	.94	2.98*	54.51	-.90
	Heavy	35	-.66	1.62			
Depression	Light	35	-1.77	4.69	4.81*	47.55	-1.69*
	Heavy	35	-5.00	10.29			
Anxiety	Light	35	-1.46	4.29	6.54*	44.16	-1.94*
	Heavy	35	-5.31	10.97			
Hostility	Light	35	-1.86	5.61	3.66*	51.28	-1.79*
	Heavy	35	-5.51	10.73			

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction (i.e., decreased attachment, depression, anxiety, or hostility).

[b]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point are for variables that do not meet the homogeneity of variance assumption. They were calculated using a formula presented by Nie et al. (1975).

[c]With $df = 40$, $t_{.05} = 1.684$ (one-tailed).

*$p < .05$.

Table 13

Correlations Between Reported Emotional Change and Other Variables (N = 70)

	Attachment change[a]	Depression change[a]	Anxiety change[a]	Hostility change[a]
Age[a]	-.04	.07	.20*	.06
Sex[b]	.08	-.01	-.06	-.16
Length of marriage[a]	.10	.08	.18	.09
Length of divorce[a]	-.29*	-.17	-.21*	-.15
Number of children[a]	-.11	.03	.07	.07
Number of children at home[a]	-.13	-.13	-.04	.06
Number of confidants[a]	.18	.08	.06	.01
Hours spent with confidants[a]	.24*	.24*	.22*	.35*
Use of psychotherapy[b]	.18	.12	.14	.16
Attitude toward divorcing[a]	.13	.14	.12	.24*
Family attitude toward divorcing[a]	.14	.05	.16	.01
Family attitude toward marriage[a]	-.13	-.10	-.14	.09
Received newsletter[b]	.11	.13	.06	.15
Reported radio use[a]	.04	.07	.04	.06
Reported television use[a]	.11	.00	.01	-.05
Reported newspaper use[a]	-.03	.04	.03	.07
Reported magazine use[a]	-.08	.08	.06	.00
Reported use of books[a]	-.02	-.06	-.11	-.03
Total reported media use[a]	.05	.06	.04	.03
Media use group[b]	.11	.20*	.23*	.21*
Attachment change[a]	1.00	.63*	.53*	.45*
Depression change[a]		1.00	.86*	.70*
Anxiety change[a]			1.00	.74*
Pretest attachment[a]	.39*			
Posttest attachment[a]	-.12			
Pretest depression[a]		.34*		
Posttest depression[a]		-.09		
Pretest anxiety[a]			.36*	
Posttest anxiety[a]			-.09	
Pretest hostility[a]				.32*
Posttest hostility[a]				-.16

[a]Continuous variable.

[b]Dichotomous variable.

*$p < .05$.

depression change was associated with reported media use. Thus, while the t test and correlation were statistically significant and supported hypothesis 2, the magnitude of the relationship between reported media use and reported depression change was minimal.

The anxiety change results for hypothesis 2 are also shown in Table 12. The mean reported anxiety change in the heavy reported media use group was significantly higher than the mean anxiety change in the light reported media use group. Also, from Table 13, the correlation between reported media use group and reported anxiety change was significant and positive ($r = .23$, $p<.05$). The correlation squared indicated that 5% of the variance in reported anxiety change was associated with reported media use. Again, the hypothesis was supported by the t-test and correlation results, but the magnitude of the relationship was small.

Hypothesis 2 was also supported by the reported hostility change results. The data analysis, reported in Table 12, indicated that the mean reported hostility change in the heavy reported media use group was significantly greater than the mean reported hostility change in the light reported media use group. As noted in Table 13, a significant positive correlation ($r = .21$, $p<.05$) was found between reported media use group and reported hostility change. The correlation squared indicated that 4% of the variance in reported hostility change was associated with reported media use. Thus, the relationship between the two variables, while statistically significant, was minimal.

Covariance Analysis of Posttest Scores

The reader may recall from the Methods section that two possible methods of data analysis were available to the experimenter. The

first, advocated by Howard et al. (1979), was to analyze change scores. That method was employed by the experimenter, and the t-test results are presented above in Table 12. The second method, advocated by Campbell and Stanley (1963), was to analyze posttest scores, using the pretest as a covariate. For the sake of interest, it was decided to complete both analyses and compare the results. The second analysis is presented with reservation, since the analysis of covariance can be misleading when random selection of subjects and random assignment to experimental conditions are not possible (see Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Therefore, caution should be used in interpreting the following results.

The posttest covariance analyses included reported media use group (heavy vs. light) as the independent variable, reported posttest emotional states (attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility) as the dependent variables, and reported pretest emotional states (attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility) as the covariates. The results are reported in Tables 14 through 17. The analyses of the main effects (reported media use groups) indicated no significant difference between the groups for posttest attachment ($p = .63$), a significant difference between the two groups for posttest anxiety ($p = .05$), and probabilities close to significant for posttest depression ($p = .08$) and posttest hostility ($p = .07$). The main effects accounted for approximately 1% of the variance, as indicated by the E^2 values in the tables. The covariates (reported pretest emotional states) accounted for significant proportions of variance, as indicated by significant F values and high E^2 (.75 to .83). This

Table 14

Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Posttest Attachment Scores

I: Source	Proportion of variance (E^2)	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Covariates						
Pretest attachment	.75	317.42	1	317.42	206.90	.00
Treatments						
Media use groups	.01	.36	1	.36	.23	.63
Error	.24	102.79	67	1.53		
Total	1.00	420.57	69	6.10		

II:	Reported media use groups	
	Light use	Heavy use
Original mean	6.63	7.09
Adjusted mean	6.93	6.79

Table 15

Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Posttest Depression Scores

I: Source	Proportion of variance (E^2)	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Covariates						
Pretest depression	.83	19054.31	1	19054.31	328.33	.00
Treatments						
Media use groups	.00	122.92	1	122.92	2.12	.08
Error	.17	3888.26	67	58.03		
Total	1.00	23065.49	69	334.28		

II:	Reported media use groups	
	Light use	Heavy use
Original mean	55.60	56.57
Adjusted mean	57.42	54.66

Table 16

Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Posttest Anxiety Scores

I: Source	Proportion of variance (E^2)	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Covariates						
Pretest anxiety	.81	18161.23	1	18161.23	291.62	.00
Treatments						
Media use groups	.01	172.31	1	172.31	2.77	.05
Error	.18	4127.53	67	62.28		
Total	1.00	22461.07	69	326.18		

II:	Reported media use groups	
	Light use	Heavy use
Original mean	53.20	54.09
Adjusted mean	55.22	52.06

Table 17

Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Posttest Hostility Scores

I: Source	Proportion of variance (E^2)	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Covariates						
Pretest hostility	.78	16124.92	1	16124.92	239.04	.00
Treatments						
Media use groups	.01	151.65	1	151.65	2.25	.07
Error	.21	4514.00	67	67.37		
Total	1.00	20790.57	69	301.31		

II:	Reported media use groups	
	Light use	Heavy use
Original mean	52.31	53.40
Adjusted mean	54.34	51.38

finding agrees with the high correlation coefficients observed between pretest and posttest emotional measures (see Table 11).

A comparison can be drawn between the method of analysis used to test the hypothesis (change scores) and the method reported for the sake of interest (posttest with pretest as covariate). The attachment and anxiety results were similar for the two analyses. A significant main effect was found for anxiety but not for attachment. However, for the depression and hostility results, the change score analysis produced significant differences between the comparison groups, while the covariance analysis of the depression and hostility results only approached significance. The analyses of covariance yielded information that was impossible to obtain from the t test. That information included the proportion of variance accounted for by the treatment groups and the proportion of variance accounted for by the pretest scores.

Covariance Analysis of Change Scores

A second set of analyses of covariance is presented for the sake of interest and further interpretation of the reported emotional change results. They include reported media use groups (heavy vs. light) as the independent variable, reported emotional changes (attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility) as the dependent variables, and four covariates: reported pretest emotional states (attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility), length of the marriage, length of the divorce, and attitude toward divorcing the ex-spouse. The results are presented in Tables 18 through 21. The reported attachment change results (see Table 18) indicated no significant main effect. However,

Table 18

Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Attachment Change During the Media Campaign

I: Source	Proportion of variance (E^2)	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Covariates						
Length of divorce	.08	9.699	1	9.699	7.236	.01
Length of marriage	.01	1.306	1	1.306	.975	.33
Attitude toward divorce	.05	6.344	1	6.344	4.733	.03
Pretest attachment	.17	20.927	1	20.927	15.612	.00
Treatments						
Media use groups	.00	.078	1	.078	.058	.41
Error	.69	85.789	64	1.340		
Total	1.00	124.143	69	1.799		

II:	Reported media use groups	
	Light use	Heavy use
Original mean	-.37[a]	-.66
Adjusted mean	-.48	-.54

[a]A minus (-) value indicates decreased attachment.

Table 19

Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Depression Change During the Media Campaign

I: Source	Proportion of variance (E^2)	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Covariates						
Length of divorce	.03	123.317	1	123.317	2.184	.14
Length of marriage	.00	18.732	1	18.732	.332	.57
Attitude toward divorce	.03	149.157	1	149.157	2.642	.11
Pretest depression	.12	523.170	1	523.170	9.267	.00
Treatments						
Media use groups	.02	106.637	1	106.637	1.889	.09
Error	.80	3613.227	64	56.457		
Total	1.00	4534.240	69	65.714		

II:	Reported media use groups	
	Light use	Heavy use
Original mean	-1.77[a]	-5.00
Adjusted mean	-2.14	-4.64

[a]A minus (-) value indicates decreased depression.

Table 20

Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Anxiety Change During the Media Campaign

I: Source	Proportion of variance (E^2)	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Covariates						
Length of divorce	.04	223.174	1	223.174	3.830	.05
Length of marriage	.03	131.795	1	131.795	2.262	.14
Attitude toward divorce	.03	174.902	1	174.902	3.002	.09
Pretest anxiety	.12	572.072	1	572.072	9.818	.00
Treatments						
Media use groups	.03	139.561	1	139.561	2.395	.07
Error	.75	3729.207	64	58.269		
Total	1.00	4970.711	69	72.039		

II:	Reported media use groups	
	Light use	Heavy use
Original mean	-1.46[a]	-5.31
Adjusted mean	-1.96	-4.82

[a]A minus (-) value indicates decreased anxiety.

Table 21

Summary of the Analysis of Covariance for Reported Hostility Change During the Media Campaign

I: Source	Proportion of variance (E^2)	ss	df	ms	F	Sig.
Covariates						
Length of divorce	.03	172.723	1	172.723	2.809	.10
Length of marriage	.03	152.716	1	152.716	2.484	.12
Attitude toward divorce	.07	357.217	1	357.217	5.810	.02
Pretest hostility	.12	624.210	1	624.210	10.153	.00
Treatments						
Media use groups	.02	125.367	1	125.367	2.039	.08
Error	.73	3934.825	64	61.482		
Total	1.00	5367.058	69	77.780		

II:	Reported media use groups	
	Light use	Heavy use
Original mean	-1.86[a]	-5.51
Adjusted mean	-2.33	-5.05

[a]A minus (-) value indicates decreased hostility.

three covariates (reported pretest attachment, length of the divorce, and attitude toward the divorce) accounted for significant proportions of variance in the analysis of reported attachment change. As seen in Table 19, there was no significant difference between the means of the media use groups on reported depression change. One covariate (reported pretest depression) accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in the analysis of reported depression change. The analysis of covariance for reported anxiety change scores, presented in Table 20, also indicated no significant difference between the reported media use groups. Two covariates (reported pretest anxiety and length of the divorce) accounted for a significant amount of the variance in the analysis. The reported hostility change scores are presented in Table 21. The mean reported hostility change scores for the two reported media use groups were not significantly different. Two covariates (reported pretest hostility and attitude toward the divorce) accounted for significant proportions of the variance in the analysis of reported hostility change.

Frequency Distributions

Table 22 presents a frequency distribution of the reported attachment change scores. Over 50% of the scores were in the "no change" category. Also, with the exception of the one high reported change score (-8) in the heavy reported media use group, the distributions of scores in the two media use groups were nearly identical. The above factors account for the lack of significant differences indicated by the statistical analyses.

Table 22

Frequency Distribution of Attachment Change Scores, Subdivided by Reported Media Use Groups

Degree of change[a]	Reported media use group: Light (n = 35)	Heavy (n = 35)	Total (N = 70)
	f	f	f
-8		1	1
-7			
-6			
-5			
-4			
-3	1	2	3
-2	4	3	7
-1	5	7	12
0	23	18	41
+1	1	4	5
+2	1		1

[a]A minus change indicates improvement in attachment.

A frequency distribution of the depression change scores is presented in Table 23. It was noted from the results in Table 12 that the standard deviations of the heavy and light reported media use groups were different (10.29 and 4.69 respectively). The frequency distribution helps explain this disparity in dispersion. The heavy reported use group had a greater range of scores (+5 to -46) than the light reported use group (+10 to -11). Although the ranges of the two groups were different, the differences between the two groups were minimized by the fact that the median and modal scores for each of the groups were 0.

Table 24 presents a frequency distribution of the reported anxiety change scores. The distribution was similar to that of the reported depression change scores. The dispersion of scores in the heavy reported use group was greater (+12 to -39) than the dispersion in the light reported use group (+7 to -19), and the median and modal scores were 0 for both groups.

The frequency distribution of the reported hostility change scores, shown in Table 25, showed a different distribution for the heavy reported media use group (+3 to -40) than for the light reported media use group (+20 to -14). The median and modal reported hostility change scores for both reported media use groups were also 0.

Table 23

Frequency Distribution of Depression Change Scores, Subdivided by Reported Media Use Groups

Degree of change[a]	Reported media use group: Light (n = 35)	Heavy (n = 35)	Total (N = 70)
	f	f	f
-46		1	1
.			
.			
.			
-25		1	1
.			
.			
.			
-19		2	2
-18			
-17			
-16		1	1
-15		1	1
-14			
-13			
-12			
-11	1		1
-10			
-9	1		1
-8	2		2
-7	1		1
-6		1	1
-5		3	3
-4	2	1	3
-3	3	1	4
-2	1	2	3
-1	1		1
0	22	17	39
+1			
+2		1	1
+3			
+4		2	2
+5		1	1
.			
.			
.			
+10	1		1

[a]A minus change indicates improvement in depression.

Table 24

Frequency Distribution of Anxiety Change Scores, Subdivided by Reported Media Use Groups

Degree of change[a]	Reported media use group: Light (n = 35)	Reported media use group: Heavy (n = 35)	Total (N = 70)
	f	f	f
-39		1	1
.			
.			
.			
-35		1	1
.			
.			
.			
-27		1	1
.			
.			
.			
-22		1	1
-21			
-20			
-19	1	1	2
-18			
-17			
-16			
-15		1	1
-14			
-13			
-12	1	1	2
-11			
-10			
-9		1	1
-8			
-7	1	2	3
-6	2		2
-5		1	1
-4	1		1
-3		1	1
-2	2	1	3
-1		1	1
0	26	19	45
.			
.			
.			
+5		1	1
+6			
+7	1		1
.			
.			
.			
+12		1	1

[a]A minus change indicates improvement in anxiety.

Table 25

Frequency Distribution of Hostility Change Scores, Subdivided by Reported Media Use Groups

Degree of change[a]	Reported media use group: Light (n = 35)	Heavy (n = 35)	Total (N = 70)
	f	f	f
-40		1	1
.			
.			
.			
-32		1	1
.			
.			
.			
-26		1	1
-25		1	1
-24			
-23		1	1
-22			
-21			
-20			
-19		1	1
.			
.			
.			
-14	3		3
.			
.			
.			
-10	1		1
-9	1		1
-8	2	1	3
-7		1	1
-6		1	1
-5	2	1	3
-4		1	1
-3	2		2
-2	1	2	3
-1			
0	22	20	42
+1			
+2		1	1
+3		1	1
.			
.			
.			
+20	1		1

[a]A minus change indicates improvement in hostility.

Additional Analyses

The following results are presented to further explain the major findings, to increase general knowledge about divorce adjustment and media use, and to generate ideas for future research. While support was found for both hypotheses of this study, the statistical analyses of reported media use accounted for only 3-5% of the variance in emotional changes and reported media use. These additional findings are presented to help explain part of the 95-97% of variance unaccounted for by the hypothesis tests. The analyses include sex, age, marital status, religious affiliation, use/non-use of local media presentations, use/non-use of psychotherapy, presence/absence of confidants, reported time with confidants, and reported media use X time with confidants. Since no a priori predictions were made on the additional analyses, all probabilities reported are two-tailed.

Sex Differences

Emotional changes and reported media use were compared between the males and females of the sample. The results are reported in Table 26. There were no differences between the sexes on the emotional change measures. On reported media use, there was one significant sex difference. Females reported using significantly more newspaper articles than did males.

Age Differences

The subjects were placed into five age categories: under 20, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, and 50 and over. A one-way analysis of variance was calculated for each of the emotional change dimensions and for

Table 26

Tests of Sex Differences in Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes

Variable	Sex	n	$\bar{X}$ media events	SD	F_{max}	df[b]	t
Use of all media combined	F	54	4.67	5.88	2.98*	86.90	1.75
	M	47	3.02	3.41			
Reported radio use	F	54	.69	2.59	5.56*	73.54	.29
	M	47	.57	1.10			
Reported television use	F	54	1.11	3.54	3.86*	81.00	.55
	M	47	.81	1.80			
Reported magazine use	F	54	.39	.79	1.06	99	.18
	M	47	.36	.76			
Reported use of books	F	54	.24	.61	1.30	99	.98
	M	47	.13	.54			
Reported newspaper use	F	54	2.24	2.50	1.38	99	2.26*
	M	47	1.19	2.12			
			$\bar{X}$ change[a]				
Attachment changes	F	40	-.43	1.08	2.20*	47.98	-.61
	M	30	-.63	1.61			
Depression changes	F	40	-3.43	7.20	1.67	68	.05
	M	30	-3.33	9.30			
Anxiety changes	F	40	-3.80	9.12	1.41	68	.47
	M	30	-2.83	7.69			
Hostility changes	F	40	-4.90	9.38	1.54	68	1.36
	M	30	-2.07	7.54			

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction (i.e., decreased attachment, depression, anxiety, or hostility).

[b]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point are for variables that do not meet the homogeneity of variance assumption. They were calculated according to a formula presented by Nie et al. (1975).

*$p < .05$.

reported media use. As reported in Table 27, there were no significant age differences in reported media use or emotional change. Also, as noted in Table 13, age was positively correlated (r = .20, $p<.05$) with anxiety change. While the correlation was significant, the relationship between the two variables accounted for 4% of the variance.

Marital Status

The sample was divided into three marital status groups: divorced, married to someone new, and remarried to the former spouse. A one-way analysis of variance was run on the marital status group means to determine differences among the three groups on reported media use and emotional changes. The results are displayed in Table 28. There were no differences among marital status groups on emotional change or reported media use.

Person Who Filed for Divorce

Table 29 reports the results for emotional changes and reported media use for those who filed for divorce vs. those whose spouses filed for divorce. The divorce filings were verified by records at the county clerk's office. There were no statistically significant emotional change or reported media use differences between those who filed for divorce and those whose spouses filed.

Religious Affiliation

As stated in the Methods section, the researcher was concerned that religious affiliation may have been a confounding variable in the study, since more than two-thirds of the sample were members of the

Table 27

Tests of Age Differences in Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes

Variable	Age group	Mean[a]	SD	n	F_{max}	F
Reported media use	15-19	2.00	2.71	4	7.32	.77
	20-29	3.73	3.55	26		
	30-39	5.68	6.43	22		
	40-49	5.43	7.33	14		
	50+	3.00	4.08	4		
Attachment change	15-19	-1.00	1.41	4	15.58*	.14
	20-29	-.50	.95	26		
	30-39	-.45	1.06	22		
	40-49	-.50	2.28	14		
	50+	-.50	.58	4		
Depression change	15-19	-3.25	6.29	4	6.87*	.51
	20-29	-3.54	6.80	26		
	30-39	-1.64	5.17	22		
	40-49	-5.43	13.55	14		
	50+	-5.00	7.57	4		
Anxiety change	15-19	-1.75	3.50	4	14.14*	.80
	20-29	-1.77	6.17	26		
	30-39	-3.23	7.36	22		
	40-49	-6.50	13.16	14		
	50+	-5.50	11.00	4		
Hostility change	15-19	-2.75	3.78	4	10.11	.16
	20-29	-3.08	6.92	26		
	30-39	-4.45	8.88	22		
	40-49	-3.21	11.89	14		
	50+	-6.00	12.00	4		

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction.

*$p < .05$.

Table 28

Tests of Marital Status Differences in Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes

Variable	Marital status	Mean[a]	SD	n	F_{max}	F
Reported media use	Divorced	4.84	5.32	50		
	Remarried, new person	3.00	3.34	13	3.07	.66
	Remarried, ex-spouse	5.29	5.85	7		
Attachment change	Divorced	-.56	1.51	50		
	Remarried, new person	-.31	.63	13	5.77*	.19
	Remarried, ex-spouse	-.57	.78	7		
Depression change	Divorced	-3.38	8.54	50		
	Remarried, new person	-3.15	5.40	13	3.46	.02
	Remarried, ex-spouse	-3.86	10.04	7		
Anxiety change	Divorced	-3.22	7.63	50		
	Remarried, new person	-1.31	8.91	13	2.68*	1.67
	Remarried, ex-spouse	-8.43	12.48	7		
Hostility change	Divorced	-3.76	6.81	50		
	Remarried, new person	-3.85	11.04	13	5.28*	.04
	Remarried, ex-spouse	-2.86	15.66	7		

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction.

*$p < .05$.

Table 29

Tests of Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes by Person Who Filed for Divorce

Variable	Who filed?	n	Mean[a]	SD	Fmax	df[b]	t
Reported media use	Self	40	5.30	6.44	3.13*	63.6	1.58
	Spouse	28	3.36	3.64			
Attachment change	Self	40	-.40	1.01	2.92*	39.9	-.77
	Spouse	28	-.68	1.72			
Depression change	Self	40	-2.30	6.45	2.44*	42.3	-1.33
	Spouse	28	-5.18	10.08			
Anxiety change	Self	40	-3.05	8.27	1.22	66	-.50
	Spouse	28	-4.11	9.15			
Hostility change	Self	40	-4.05	8.49	1.21	66	.28
	Spouse	28	-3.43	9.36			

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction.

[b]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point were calculated due to heterogeneity of variance.

*$p < .05$.

Mormon church. Therefore, it was decided to analyze the results to determine whether the reported media use and emotional changes of Mormons were different from those of the rest of the sample. The results, presented in Table 30, indicate that membership in the Mormon church was not a statistically significant factor with reported media use or emotional changes.

Use of Local Media

The experimenter was interested in whether those who reported using the locally produced media events (radio shows and newspaper articles) reported greater emotional changes than those who did not report utilizing the local media. The results, shown in Table 31, indicate that those who reported utilizing the local media changed more in reported depression, anxiety, and hostility than those who did not report utilizing the local media. There was no difference between the two groups on attachment change.

Use of Psychotherapy

Recently divorced persons were asked whether they sought psychotherapy for assistance with adjusting to divorce. The results showed that more than one-third (35.7%) of the subjects reported having therapy since the divorce. The results in Table 32 indicate no differences in reported emotional changes or reported media use between those who saw professional counselors and those who did not.

Availability of Confidants

The subjects were also asked whether they had friends, family members, neighbors, or co-workers in whom they could confide about

Table 30

Tests of Religious Affiliation Differences in Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes

Variable	Religious affiliation	n	Mean[a]	SD	Fmax	df[b]	t
Reported media use	Mormon	47	4.62	5.50	1.01	68	.16
	Non-Mormon	23	4.39	5.46			
Attachment change	Mormon	47	-.40	1.01	3.20*	28.9	-.82
	Non-Mormon	23	-.74	1.82			
Depression change	Mormon	47	-2.68	6.38	2.89*	29.7	-.88
	Non-Mormon	23	-4.83	10.85			
Anxiety change	Mormon	47	-2.51	7.47	1.87	68	-1.24
	Non-Mormon	23	-5.17	10.21			
Hostility change	Mormon	47	-3.94	8.36	1.30	68	.34
	Non-Mormon	23	-3.17	9.52			

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction.

[b]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point were calculated due to heterogeneity of variance.

*$p < .05$.

Table 31

Tests of Reported Emotional Changes by Reported Use/Nonuse of Local Media

Variable	Use local media?	n	Mean[a]	SD	Fmax	df[b]	t
Attachment change	No	24	-.38	.92	2.63*	66.0	-.73
	Yes	46	-.59	1.5			
Depression change	No	24	-1.08	2.34	17.10*	54.3	-2.33*
	Yes	46	-4.59	9.67			
Anxiety change	No	24	-1.00	2.77	13.33*	56.6	-2.28*
	Yes	46	-4.63	10.10			
Hostility change	No	24	-1.21	5.96	2.61*	65.9	-2.02*
	Yes	46	-4.98	9.63			

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction.

[b]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point were calculated due to heterogeneity of variance.

*$p < .05$.

Table 32

Tests of Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes According to Use/Nonuse of Psychotherapy

Variable	Use psycho-therapy?	n	Mean[a]	SD	Fmax	df[b]	t
Reported media use	No	45	4.22	5.82	1.50	68	-.66
	Yes	25	5.12	4.76			
Attachment change	No	45	-.33	.91	4.14*	30.6	-1.29
	Yes	25	-.84	1.84			
Depression change	No	45	-2.69	6.63	2.40*	35.4	-.86
	Yes	25	-4.64	10.27			
Anxiety change	No	45	-2.49	7.04	2.26*	36.1	-1.06
	Yes	25	-5.00	10.59			
Hostility change	No	45	-2.67	8.06	1.43	68	-1.32
	Yes	25	-5.52	9.63			

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction.

[b]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point were calculated due to heterogeneity of variance.

*$p < .05$.

their divorce-related problems. More than two-thirds (68.6%) of the subjects reported having one or more persons to confide in about their problems. The sample reported a mean of 3.7 confidants. The range was 0-20 and the standard deviation was 4.35. The results in Table 33 indicate that the subjects who reported having confidants available changed significantly (statistically) more in attachment than subjects who reported no available confidants. There were no differences between the two groups on other emotional changes or on reported media use.

Reported Time with Confidants

The subjects estimated the number of hours they spent with confidants (if available) during the month prior to the interview. They reported spending a mean of 58.8 hours with confidants during the previous month. The range was 0-400 and the median was 9. More than one-third (35.7%) reported spending no time with confidants. The sample was divided into two groups (those who reportedly spent time and those who did not), which were compared for differences in reported media use and emotional changes. The results in Table 34 indicate no difference between the two groups in reported media use. However, those who spent time with confidants reported significantly greater positive changes in attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility than those who did not report spending time with confidants.

Reported Media Use X
Time with Confidants

From the results presented above, two variables have been significantly related to emotional changes: reported media use and

Table 33

Tests of Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes According to Availability of Confidants

Variable	Confidants available?	n	Mean[a]	SD	Fmax	df[b]	t
Reported media use	No	22	3.55	4.46	1.71	68	-1.04
	Yes	48	5.00	5.83			
Attachment change	No	22	0.00	.54	7.97*	65.3	-3.05*
	Yes	48	-.75	1.51			
Depression change	No	22	-1.41	6.29	1.92	68	-1.39
	Yes	48	-4.29	8.72			
Anxiety change	No	22	-3.41	8.33	1.08	68	.02
	Yes	48	-3.38	8.65			
Hostility change	No	22	-1.86	8.80	1.05	68	-1.19
	Yes	48	-4.52	8.61			

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction.

[b]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point were calculated due to heterogeneity of variance.

*$p < .05$.

Table 34

Tests of Reported Media Use and Emotional Changes According to Time with Confidants

Variable	Time with confidants?	n	Mean[a]	SD	Fmax	df[b]	t
Reported media use	No	25	4.52	6.76	2.12*	36.9	-.02
	Yes	45	4.56	4.64			
Attachment change	No	25	-.04	.54	8.29*	60.0	-2.89*
	Yes	45	-.78	1.55			
Depression change	No	25	-.72	2.30	17.71*	52.4	-2.74*
	Yes	45	-4.87	9.68			
Anxiety change	No	25	-.92	4.54	4.69*	66.4	-2.23*
	Yes	45	-4.76	9.82			
Hostility change	No	25	-.64	5.39	3.25*	68.0	-2.62*
	Yes	45	-5.38	9.72			

[a]A minus (-) value indicates changes in a desirable direction.

[b]The degrees of freedom that include a decimal point were calculated due to heterogeneity of variance.

*$p < .05$.

whether time was reportedly spent with confidants. It was decided to analyze the two variables in combination to observe possible interactions. Therefore, the data were submitted to a 2 X 2 analysis of variance. The results are presented in Tables 35 and 36. None of the interactions were significant, indicating that the effects of reported media use and time with confidants were likely independent.

Table 35

Mean Emotional Changes by Time with Confidants and Media Use

Emotional dimension	Media use group		Was time spent with confidants? No	Yes	Marginal means
Attachment change	Light		-.19 (16)[a]	-.53 (19)	-.37 (35)
	Heavy		+.22 (9)	-.96 (26)	-.66 (35)
		Marginal means:	-.04 (25)	-.78 (45)	
Depression change	Light		-.94	-2.47	-1.77
	Heavy		-.33	-6.62	-5.00
		Marginal means:	-.72	-4.87	
Anxiety change	Light		-.56	-2.21	-1.46
	Heavy		-1.56	-6.62	-5.31
		Marginal means:	-.92	-4.76	
Hostility change	Light		-.56	-2.95	-1.86
	Heavy		-.78	-7.15	-5.51
		Marginal means:	-.64	-5.38	

[a]The numbers in parentheses represent n.

Table 36

Analysis of Variance Summaries for Emotional Changes with Time with Confidants X Media Use

Variable	Source of variation	df	MS	F
Attachment change	Media use	1	.35	.21
	Time with confidants	1	7.67	4.61*
	Media X confidants	1	2.70	1.62
	Residual	66	1.66	
	Total	69	1.76	
Depression change	Media use	1	105.32	1.71
	Time with confidants	1	199.26	3.24
	Media X confidants	1	85.09	1.38
	Residual	66	61.54	
	Total	69	65.63	
Anxiety change	Media use	1	174.71	2.55
	Time with confidants	1	150.78	2.20
	Media X confidants	1	43.98	.64
	Residual	66	68.45	
	Total	69	72.07	
Hostility change	Media use	1	134.33	1.90
	Time with confidants	1	261.02	3.70
	Media X confidants	1	60.18	.85
	Residual	66	70.60	
	Total	69	75.58	

*$p < .05$

Summary of Results

1. Seventy-eight (77.2%) of the 101 subjects interviewed reported utilizing one or more media events. The average subject reported using 3.9 media events, 2.39 of which were locally produced (radio and newspaper presentations).

2. Newspapers were the most heavily utilized, according to the subjects' reports. The other media reported used, in descending order, were television, radio, magazines, and books.

3. Subjects who received a media-promoting newsletter reported using a mean of 4.95 media events, while subjects who did not receive a newsletter reported utilizing a mean of 3.12 media events. The difference between the two means was statistically significant. However, the correlation between receipt of newsletter and reported media use was .18, which indicated a common variance of 3.2% between the two variables.

4. A *t*-test analysis of the pre-post emotional changes for all subjects combined indicated that the posttest means for attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility were significantly (statistically) lower than the retrospective pretest means for the same measures.

5. There were significant positive correlations (ranging from .87 to .91) between pretest and posttest scores on measures of attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility.

6. There was no difference in reported attachment change between the heavy reported media use group and the light reported media use group. Hypothesis 2 was not supported by the attachment change results.

7. The reported depression, anxiety, and hostility change means of the heavy reported media use group were significantly greater than the reported depression, anxiety, and hostility change means of the light reported media use group. Hypothesis 2 was supported by the depression, anxiety, and hostility results. While the t-test and correlational results for reported depression, anxiety, and hostility changes were statistically significant, the correlations squared showed that reported emotional change had only 3% to 5% common variance that was associated with reported media use.

8. A significant negative correlation was found between length of divorce and positive changes in attachment. The same relationship was found between length of divorce and positive changes in anxiety.

9. A significant positive correlation was observed between attitude toward divorcing the ex-partner and positive changes in hostility.

10. No significant differences were found between males and females in reported media use of emotional changes, with one exception: females reported using significantly more newspaper articles than did males.

11. No significant differences were found among age groups in emotional changes or reported media use.

12. No significant differences in reported emotional changes or media use were found among divorced persons, persons remarried to someone new, and persons remarried to the former spouse.

13. No significant differences in reported emotional changes or media use were found between persons who filed for divorce and persons whose spouses filed for divorce.

14. No significant differences were found between Mormons and non-Mormons in emotional changes or reported media use.

15. Subjects who reported utilizing the locally produced segment of the media campaign (newspaper articles and radio shows) reported significantly greater improvements in depression, anxiety, and hostility than subjects who did not report utilizing the locally produced campaign. There was no significant difference between the two groups on attachment change.

16. There was no significant difference in reported emotional change or media use between the subjects who reported using psychotherapy for divorce recovery and those who did not report utilizing psychotherapy.

17. Subjects who reported having one or more confidants available to talk with about divorce-related problems reported significantly greater improvements in attachment than subjects who reported having no confidants available. There were no significant differences between the two groups on reported media use or changes in depression, anxiety, or hostility.

18. Subjects who reported spending time with confidants during the prior month reported significantly greater changes in attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility than subjects who did not report spending time with confidants. There was no significant difference between the two groups on reported media use.

19. There was not a significant interaction between reported media use and reported time spent with confidants on any of the reported emotional change measures.

20. The greatest emotional changes were reported by subjects who also reported heavy media use and time spent with confidants. The smallest emotional changes were reported by subjects who also reported light or no media use and no time with confidants.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the conclusions that have been drawn from the results of this study. The topics include reported use of the campaign by recently divorced persons, the relationship between receiving the newsletter and reported media use (the test of hypothesis 1), emotional changes (including the test of hypothesis 2), limitations of the study, proposed directions for future research, and a conclusion.

Reported Use of the Campaign

One of the primary objectives of this study was to determine whether the media campaign was utilized by the target audience--recently divorced persons. Atkin (1979, 1981) concluded that one of the most common causes of failure with media information campaigns is that the message does not reach the receiver. His advice for constructing a successful campaign, taken from previous research findings, included the following: define and analyze the target audience, construct messages that meet the needs of the receivers, and utilize times and communication channels that are accessible to the audience. Atkin's advice was followed for this study. The results showed that 77.2% of the sample reported using one or more segments of the campaign. The 101 recently divorced persons reportedly used a mean of 3.90 media events. Newspaper articles were reportedly the most heavily used segment of the campaign. These results were encouraging to the experimenter. It was concluded that the divorce adjustment

media campaign apparently reached a substantial portion of the audience for whom it was intended.

The Newsletter and Reported Media Use

The first hypothesis predicted that recently divorced persons who received a promotional newsletter would report using significantly more media events than recently divorced persons who did not receive a newsletter. The results supported hypothesis 1. When the means were compared, the newsletter group reported using 1.83 more media events than the group that did not receive the newsletter. The *t*-test results were significant, but the nonparametric test results were not. Also, the squared correlation between the two variables indicated that only 3.2% of the variance in reported media use was associated with receipt or nonreceipt of the newsletter. Thus, the relationship between the newsletter and reported media use appears to be limited. Therefore, if receipt of newsletter caused any increase in reported media use among the recently divorced persons, it was not a major factor.

The statistically significant parametric results for all media combined did not hold for any individual medium. There were no significant differences between the newsletter and no newsletter groups on reported use of television, radio, newspapers, magazines, or books. Moreover, squared correlation coefficients were small, ranging from .004 to .029. Any generalizations from this study about the association between newsletter receipt and reported media use must be restricted to a multi-media information campaign, and not to a campaign that is limited to any one medium.

A media campaign designer may be interested in whether sending a newsletter to members of a target audience will increase the percentage of persons who will utilize a campaign. The findings of this study indicate that a newsletter will not likely do so. The results, seen in Table 5, showed that 79.1% of the newsletter group reported utilizing one or more segments of the campaign, while 75.9% of the no newsletter group reported utilizing one or more segments of the campaign. The reported 3.2% increase in use by the targeted group was small. Therefore, if a campaign designer is interested only in building the size of the audience or in increasing use of a specific medium such as radio or newspapers, the newsletter would not likely be helpful. Even if a designer desires to increase the number of times each audience member will utilize a multi-media campaign, the results of this study suggest that small effects might be anticipated.

Emotional Changes

According to DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach (1982), the impact of mass media on the emotional states of the audience is one of the least explored areas of media effects research. The results of this study contribute to that area. The emotional change results are discussed under three subtopics: levels of change reported by subjects as a total group, support for hypothesis 2, and implications of the additional analyses.

Reported Emotional Changes for All Subjects Combined

A number of conclusions can be drawn about the subjects' reported emotional states. First, the respondents were reportedly in a range of

fair-to-good emotional adjustment on the retrospective pretest. Their mean reported level of attachment was 7.37. The attachment scale, developed by Brown et al. (1980), ranges from 5 (the lowest degree of attachment possible) to 13 (the highest possible degree of attachment). From a sample of 192 separated persons, Brown reported a mean attachment score of 8.18, which is comparable to the results found on the pretest of this study.

The depression, anxiety, and hostility results on the retrospective pretest also indicated a moderate degree of emotional adjustment. The pretest means, based on a standardized scale with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10, ranged from 56.54 for hostility to 59.47 for depression. From these reported emotional results, it can be concluded that the subjects appeared to be moderately well adjusted emotionally at the beginning of the media campaign.

A second conclusion that can be drawn from the emotional measures is that the subjects as a group reportedly changed to a higher level of emotional adjustment during the five weeks of the study. The posttest attachment mean was 6.86, indicating a decrease in emotional attachment to the ex-spouse. The posttest means on the SCL-90-R ranged from 52.86 for hostility to 56.09 for depression, also indicating emotional improvements. The pre-post changes in reported emotional states were all statistically significant ($p<.005$).

The third conclusion drawn from the emotional change results of the subjects as a group is that the retrospective pretest and posttest results were highly related. That was evidenced by significant

positive correlations between the pretest and posttest scores on attachment (r = .87), depression (r = .91), anxiety (r = .90), and hostility (r = .88). What could account for this extremely strong relationship between the pretest and posttest results?

One possible explanation is that the subjects answered every question on the emotional measure similarly, without changing as they progressed down the page. A visual examination of the questionnaires produced evidence against the above explanation. Only four of the 70 subjects gave the same answer to all questions on the emotional measure. Another possible reason for the high correlations is that the emotional states being measured were extremely stable. However, the fact that the pretest and posttest means were significantly different, while the pretest and posttest standard deviations were nearly identical, argues against this explanation. A final possible explanation is that since the posttest and retrospective pretest were administered together, the subjects answered the pre-post questions similarly without discriminating between present and past emotional states. Evidence of this explanation can be seen in Tables 22 through 25. The frequency distributions of the emotional change scores show that a majority of the subjects (41 of 70 on the attachment measure, 39 of 70 on the depression measure, 45 of 70 on the anxiety measure, and 42 of 70 on the hostility measure) answered the retrospective pretest the same as they answered the posttest. Yet, even this evidence is not conclusive, and could support the idea that the emotional states being measured were extremely stable. Thus, the reason for the extremely high pre-post correlations is not clear from the evidence available.

The Test of Hypothesis 2

Another major objective of this study was to determine the emotional impact of the media campaign. The second hypothesis predicted that heavy reported users of the campaign would report greater emotional improvements than light reported users. The results of the parametric analyses of means supported hypothesis 2 for the depression, anxiety, and hostility results, but not for the attachment results. However, in all cases, the medians and modes were identical for the two reported media use groups. These results, along with the low correlations between reported media use and emotional change, raise serious questions about the parametric analyses.

In the case of the significant parametric results, can it be concluded that the media campaign caused emotional improvements? Such a conclusion cannot be drawn for the following reasons. First, hypothesis 2 was not tested with a true experimental design, but with a "nonequivalent control group" design. The subjects were not randomly assigned to groups or to experimental treatments, but selected themselves into groups by their reported utilization of the media campaign. From the results found, it would be just as logical to conclude that recently divorced persons who experienced emotional improvements sought out media events to reinforce their changes, so that emotional changes caused media use, as to argue that the media campaign caused emotional improvements.

A second reason against inferring a causal relationship between the variables is that as noted above, the differences between the heavy and light reported media use groups were not as great as the means and

t tests indicated. The frequency distributions (see Tables 22 through 25) indicated that the modal and median reported emotional change scores were zero for both the heavy and light reported media use groups. By the same token, the shared variance between the media use groups and reported emotional changes was relatively small. The squared correlations between the two variables yielded common variances ranging from 4 to 5%, indicating a very weak relationship between reported media use and reported emotional changes.

In summary, statistically significant differences were noted between heavy and light reported media use groups on reported improvements in depression, anxiety, and hostility when means were analyzed. However, the variance in the dependent variables associated with the independent variables was limited, and a causal relationship cannot be inferred between reported media use and reported emotional changes.

Additional Analyses

The purposes of the additional analyses were to add to general knowledge about divorce adjustment and mass media effects, to generate ideas for future research, and to clarify the results of the hypothesis tests. Since the tests of hypotheses accounted for low proportions of common variance between reported media use and emotional improvements, further analyses were conducted to explore what other variables may have accounted for the significant reported emotional improvements.

A majority of the additional analyses revealed no statistically significant relationships between the variables and reported emotional changes. For example, there was no relationship between reported emotional changes and sex, age, length of marriage, number of children

in the marriage, number of children living with the subject, person who filed for divorce, the family's attitude toward the marriage, or the family's attitude toward the divorce.

The experimenter was concerned that since more than 65% of the sample were reportedly members of the Mormon church, the results would be limited in generalizability. Therefore, it was decided to analyze the differences between the Mormons and non-Mormons in the sample. The results showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups on any of the emotional measures or on reported media use. It was concluded, therefore, that the Mormons studied were not significantly different from the non-Mormons around them concerning these divorce adjustment variables.

Another area of interest was the relationship between reported emotional improvement and reported utilization of psychotherapy for divorce recovery. Kitson and Raschke's (1981) review of divorce research found no available evidence on the effects of psychotherapy on divorce recovery. The results of this study may be some of the first in that area. They showed no significant differences between those who reported utilizing psychotherapy and those who did not on any of the emotional improvement measures. Thus, it was concluded that psychotherapy did not apparently have an effect on the reported attachment, depression, anxiety, or hostility of the subjects.

A number of significant relationships were discovered between emotional changes and other variables. First, attitude toward the divorce was significantly related to reported hostility change. A positive initial attitude toward divorcing the ex-spouse was associated

with greater hostility improvement. Second, length of the divorce was negatively related to reported changes in attachment and anxiety. That is, the longer the period of the divorce, the less the improvement in attachment and anxiety. Conversely, the shorter the time since the divorce, the greater the reported improvement in attachment and anxiety. From these results, it appears that greater changes in anxiety and attachment were reported by the subjects during the initial stages of divorce than during the latter part of the first year of divorce.

The strongest relationship observed between reported emotional changes and other variables in this study was between emotional changes and time spent with confidants. The subjects who reported spending time with friends, family members, lovers, or other confidants also reported significantly greater improvements in attachment, depression, anxiety, and hostility than subjects who did not report spending time with confidants. The common variance between emotional changes and time with confidants ranged from 4.8% to 12.3%. Since a true experimental design was not used for this analysis, a causal relationship cannot be inferred between time spent with confidants and reported emotional improvements. However, it can be concluded that a moderately strong relationship exists between those two variables. The fact that involvement with confidants was related to improvements in attachment is consistent with the findings of Weiss (1976) and Brown et al. (1980). They found that attachment improvements were linked to building new relationships. The findings of this study are consistent with those reported by Chiriboga et al. (1979), who found that 60% of

persons involved in marital breakup turn to significant others for help with recovery.

The final emotional change finding on which comment is needed is the relationship between reported media use and time spent with confidants. A two-way analysis of variance indicated no statistically significant interaction between the two variables. The effects of reported media use and reported time spent with confidants were apparently independent. However, when the means were inspected (see Table 35), it was discovered that the greatest mean reported emotional improvement was for those who reportedly spent time with confidants and heavily used the media campaign. On the other hand, those who reported the lowest mean emotional improvement were those who reportedly did not spend time with confidants and who reported little or no use of the media campaign. Again, a causal relationship cannot be claimed for confidants or media use on emotional improvement. However, these results support the same advice that professionals, friends, and other purveyors of common sense have advocated for divorced persons: "Spend time with your friends and seek information about divorce. Being with your friends will provide comfort and keep your mind off yourself. Seeking information about divorce will help you realize that you are not alone in your suffering. Eventually, you will feel good again."

Limitations

A number of limitations of this study were recognized. First, the study was based on self-report data. For the test of hypothesis 1, the subjects reported the number of media events utilized during the

campaign. While the experimenter employed safeguards against distortions (e.g., asking each subject to elaborate on reported media use by naming the medium used and describing the content of the message), there remained the opportunity for subjects to exaggerate the extent of media use. Conversely, subjects may have utilized the campaign, but forgot, or refused to disclose the media use to the interviewer. Thus, bias due to self-report was possible in both positive and negative directions.

The second hypothesis was also tested with self-report data from a questionnaire completed by the subjects. It is possible that social demand characteristics may have influenced those results. It may have been more socially acceptable for the subjects to appear emotionally improved at the end of the five weeks than to have revealed actual negative changes in their emotions. However, the fact that several of the subjects did report negative changes on the measures demonstrated that not all respondents answered with socially acceptable responses.

Two steps were taken to decrease the possibility of contamination on the self-report measures. First, the interviewer assured the subjects of anonymity and confidentiality of the results by instructing them not to write their names on the questionnaires. Second, the interviewer encouraged each subject to answer the questions honestly.

A second limitation of this study is that a "nonequivalent control group" design was used to test hypothesis 2. Because the independent variable (reported media use) relied on the subjects' choices to utilize or not utilize the campaign, the subjects could not be randomly assigned to the experimental conditions. While the nonequivalent

control group design is superior to a design that lacks a control group (Campbell & Stanley, 1963), it nevertheless restricts interpretation of the results. For example, since the design was not truly experimental, it cannot be concluded that heavy reported media use caused the reported change in depression, anxiety, or hostility.

The results of this study are also limited in generalizability. The target population was divorced less than one year and was living in a rural area. The generalizability is further limited by the choice of geographic area in which to conduct the study. Rural northern Utah may be different from rural West Virginia, northern Vermont, southern Alabama, eastern Oregon, or another rural area. However, a similar campaign may help to sensitize the thinking of recently divorced persons living in rural areas that have similar demographic characteristics (i.e., western-midwestern, high educational level, reliance on agriculture plus one major employer for employment, predominance of a fundamentalist religious orientation, and low incidence of minority groups). Generalizability is also limited by the fact that the study was conducted using only those persons available for interviewing. As stated in the methodology section, 41% of the persons in the county who were divorced within the past 12 months were interviewed. One percent refused to participate, 21% had reportedly moved from the county, and 37% could not be located. The study does not reflect the reported emotional changes or media use patterns of those who were mobile, remarried, living with parents, or otherwise unavailable for study.

Future Research

The findings of this study generated several ideas for further research. First, the use of a newsletter to promote a media campaign needs further investigation. Future studies could increase the number of newsletters sent in order to determine whether a greater number of promotion attempts will increase reported media use. Also, newsletters need to be tested with other topics on other target groups before a general statement can be made about the utility of a newsletter for promoting media information campaigns.

A second area that needs further research is the relationship between receiving divorce adjustment messages and emotional changes among recently divorced persons. The results of this study have left unanswered the question of whether the campaign messages promoted emotional improvement. That question could be further investigated by recruiting a group of recently divorced persons and randomly dividing them into two groups. The experimental group would be given a series of divorce adjustment messages (both in newspaper format and on audio tape to simulate radio format) to take home and use as they would normally use other media offerings. The control group could be given a series of messages unrelated to divorce adjustment, to use in a way similar to those given the experimental group. After five weeks, use of the messages could be verified, and the two groups could be compared for emotional changes. Such a procedure would allow more definitive conclusions about the effects of adjustment-related messages on the emotional states of recently divorced persons.

Additional research is also needed to improve measurement of emotional changes after divorce. This study also left the phenomenon of the strong relationship between the pre-post emotional results unexplained. Future investigations could distinguish between pretest and posttest emotional states by separating the retrospective pretest from the posttest. One possibility would be to administer the posttest immediately after the campaign, then administer the retrospective pretest later, when the memory of the posttest answers has faded. Another approach would be to use a more conventional pretest-posttest approach, expanded into a Solomon Four design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) to factor out the effects of the pretest. Another need in the area of measurement is to develop measures that rely less on self-report. One possibility would be to utilize reports of significant others for measuring adjustment to divorce. Another is to measure observable behaviors from which emotional states can be inferred. Also, improvements in knowledge can be tested to determine whether information level is an important intervening variable in emotional change.

Finally, another area that needs further research is the relationship between the use of media and time spent with confidants by recently divorced persons. This study found that both reported media use and time spent with confidants were related to emotional improvement. A number of research questions arise from those findings. Did the confidants utilize the media campaign? If so, to what degree did the campaign influence their knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors regarding divorce? Did they utilize information from the campaign in

their conversations with divorced family members, lovers, friends, co-workers, or neighbors? These and other research questions could be investigated by interviewing a group of recently divorced persons who could be asked to identify their confidants. After testing the informational, attitudinal, emotional, and behavioral states of the divorced persons, the confidants could be located and tested for knowledge, attitudes, media use, and helping behaviors. Such a study could help determine the degree to which a media campaign can help confidants assist their divorced friends or family members.

Conclusion

Bloom's (1978) challenge, presenting divorce as "an irresistible candidate for preventive intervention programs . . ." (p. 888) was successfully met in rural northern Utah. A five-week media campaign that included 10 radio shows, 50+ radio spot announcements, and 16 newspaper articles, was produced for the purpose of promoting divorce adjustment. The reported use of the campaign was substantial (77.2%) among recently divorced persons. This supported DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach's (1982) idea that in times of heightened change and conflict (such as divorce), media use is increased. An earlier study by the experimenter (see Chapter II, "Local Studies") found that 42% of the local residents reported utilizing local on-going psycho-educational offerings on the radio and in the newspapers. However, when the topic of the media offerings was divorce adjustment, and the audience was experiencing the change and conflict surrounding divorce, reported media use was 77.2%.

Support was also found for DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach's (1982) assertion that "the process of mass communication is itself dreadfully complicated" (p. 254). The results of this study illustrate how their tripartite interaction model (individual-media-society) is useful for analyzing the effects of a mass media information campaign. For example, this study attempted to discover the relationship between reported media use and emotional improvements. The results showed that emotional improvement was related to reported media use, but to a very limited degree. Had the variables of this study been limited to media behaviors, the conclusions drawn from the results would have been narrow. However, other factors were studied and discovered to be important to emotional adjustment to divorce. They included length of the divorce (a time-related factor), attitude toward the divorce (a cognitive factor), and time spent with confidants (a social-interpersonal factor). This study supported the idea that mass media effects must be studied in a way that takes into account "interaction among the society, the media system, and the people who compose media audiences" (DeFleur & Ball-Rokeach, 1982, pp. 253-254).

Finally, this study combined orientations and expertise from the fields of clinical psychology and mass communication to add to the knowledge of prevention of mental disorders, adjustment to divorce, and mass communication effects. Its contributions fall within the boundaries of the new branch of psychology called "media psychology."[2]

---

[2]The Association for Media Psychologists was formally organized on February 4, 1982, in San Diego, California. This was confirmed in a telephone conversation with Jacqueline Bouhoutsos, Ph.D., president of the Association.

The results of this study should aid media psychologists, prevention specialists, and media experts as they attempt to improve the conditions of society.

Reference Notes

1. Hollister, W. G. Personal communication, June 1978.

2. Barney, R. D., & Johnson, C. L. Survey of market and advertising perceptions in the Brigham City, Utah, area. Unpublished manuscript, Brigham Young University, 1978.

References

American Psychological Association. Ethical principles of psychologists. American Psychologist, 1981, 36, 633-638.

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1976.

Anderson, N. H. Scales and statistics: Parametric and nonparametric. In R. E. Kirk (Ed.), Statistical issues: A reader for the behavioral sciences. Monterey, Ca.: Brooks/Cole, 1972.

Atkin, C. K. Mass media information campaign effectiveness. In R. E. Rice & W. J. Paisley (Eds.), Public communication campaigns. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, 1981.

Atkin, C. K. Research evidence on mass mediated health communication campaigns. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 3. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1979.

Bane, M. J. Marital disruption and the lives of children. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 103-117.

Baran, S. J. TV programming and attitudes toward mental retardation. Journalism Quarterly, 1977, 54, 140-142.

Berman, W. H., & Turk, D. C. Adaptation to divorce: Problems and coping strategies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1981, 43, 179-189.

Blair, M. Divorcee's adjustment and attitudinal changes about life. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30, 5541-5542.

Bloom, B. L., Asher, S. J., & White, S. W. Marital disruption as a stressor: A review and analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 1978, 85, 867-894.

Boneau, C. A. A note on measurement scales and statistical tests. In R. E. Kirk (Ed.), Statistical issues: A reader for the behavioral sciences. Monterey, Ca.: Brooks/Cole, 1972.

Boneau, C. A. The effects of violations of assumptions underlying the t test. Psychological Bulletin, 1960, 57, 49-64.

Brinkerhoff, R. Selected business statistics, Utah counties. Utah Economic and Business Review, 1980, 40, 1-13.

Brown, C. A., Feldberg, R., Fox, E. M., & Kohen, J. Divorce: Chance of a new lifetime. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 119-133.

Brown, P., Felton, B., Whiteman, V., & Manela, R. Attachment and distress following marital separation. Journal of Divorce, 1980, 3, 303-317.

Bureau of Economic and Business Research. Utah County economic facts: Box Elder County. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1979.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Chiriboga, D. A., Coho, A., Stein, J. A., & Roberts, J. Divorce, stress and social supports: A study in help seeking behavior. Journal of Divorce, 1979, 3, 121-135.

Chiriboga, D. A., & Cutler, L. Stress responses among divorcing men and women. Journal of Divorce, 1977, 1, 95-106.

Chiriboga, D. A., Roberts, J., & Stein, J. A. Psychological well-being during marital separation. Journal of Divorce, 1978, 2, 21-36.

Cohen, B. C. The press and foreign policy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

DeFleur, M. L. Theories of mass communication (2nd ed.). New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970.

DeFleur, M. L., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. Theories of mass communication (4th ed.). New York: Longman, 1982.

Derogatis, L. R. The SCL-90 manual I: Scoring, administration and procedures for the SCL-90. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Clinical Psychometrics Unit, 1977.

Derogatis, L. R., & Cleary, P. A. Confirmation of the dimensional structure of the SCL-90: A study in construct validation. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 981-989.

Douglas, D. F., Westley, B. H., & Chaffee, S. H. An information campaign that changed community attitudes. Journalism Quarterly, 1970, 47, 479-487.

Dretzke, B. J., Levin, J. R., & Serlin, R. C. Testing for regression homogeneity under variance heterogeneity. Psychological Bulletin, 1982, 91, 376-383.

Farquhar, J. W., Maccoby, N., Wood, P. D., Alexander, J. K., Breitrose, H., Brown, B. W., Jr., Haskell, W. L., McAlister, A. L., Meyer, A. J., Nash, J. D., & Stern, M. P. Community education for cardiovascular health. The Lancet, 1977, 1192-1195.

Festinger, L., & Maccoby, N. On resistance to persuasive communications. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 359-366.

Flay, B. R., & Cook, T. D. Evaluation of mass media prevention campaigns. In R. E. Rice & W. J. Paisley (Eds.), Public communication campaigns. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, 1981.

Foley, A. R., & Gorham, P. Toward a new philosophy of care: Perspectives on prevention. Community Mental Health Journal, 1973, 9, 99-107.

Glass, G. V, Peckham, P. D., & Sanders, J. R. Consequences of failure to meet assumptions underlying the fixed effects analyses of variance and covariance. Review of Educational Research, 1972, 42, 237-288.

Goldston, S. E. An overview of primary prevention programing. In D. C. Klein & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), Primary prevention: An idea whose time has come. Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, DHEW Publication No. (ADM) 77-447, 1977.

Goldston, S. E. Mental health education in a community mental health center. In A. J. Bindman & A. D. Spiegel (Eds.), Perspectives in community mental health. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1969.

Goode, W. J. Women in divorce. New York: Free Press, 1956.

Gray, G. M. The nature of the psychological impact of divorce upon the individual. Journal of Divorce, 1978, 1, 289-301.

Hackney, G. R., & Ribordy, S. C. An empirical investigation of emotional reactions to divorce. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1980, 36, 105-110.

Haefner, J. E. Can TV advertising influence employers to hire or train disadvantaged persons? Journalism Quarterly, 1976, 53, 211-215.

Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. Divorced fathers. Psychology Today, 1977, 10, 42-46.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1979.

Hollister, W. G. Basic strategies in designing primary prevention programs. In D. C. Klein & S. E. Goldston (Eds.), Primary prevention: An idea whose time has come. Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, DHEW Publication No. (ADM) 77-447, 1977.

Hovland, C. E., Lumsdaine, A. A., & Sheffield, F. D. Experiments on mass communication. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949.

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. Communication and persuasion. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1953.

Howard, G. S., Ralph, K. M., Gulanick, N. A., Maxwell, S. E., Nance, D. W., & Gerber, S. K. Internal invalidity in pretest-posttest self-report evaluations and a re-evaluation of retrospective pretests. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1979, 3, 1-23.

Janis, I. L., & Feshbach, S. Effects of fear-arousing communications. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 78-92.

Janis, I. L., Hovland, C. I., Field, P. B., Linton, H., Graham, E., Cohen, A. R., Rife, D., Abelson, R. P., Lesser, G. S., & King, B. T. Personality and persuasibility. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1959.

Jeffrey, M. J., & Reeve, R. E. Community mental health services in rural areas: Some practical issues. Community Mental Health Journal, 1978, 14, 54-62.

Katz, E. The two-step flow of communication: An up-to-date report on an hypothesis. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1957, 21, 61-78.

Kerlinger, F. N., & Pedhazur, E. J. Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973.

Kitson, G. C., & Raschke, H. J. Divorce research: What we know; what we need to know. Journal of Divorce, 1981, 4, 1-37.

Klapper, J. T. The effects of mass communication. New York: The Free Press, 1960.

Kraus, S. The crisis of divorce: Growth promoting or pathogenic? Journal of Divorce, 1979, 3, 107-119.

Labovitz, S. Some observations on measurement and statistics. Social Forces, 1967, 46, 155-160.

Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B., & Gaudet, H. The people's choice: How the voter makes up his mind in a presidential campaign. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948.

Maccoby, N., & Farquhar, J. W. Communication for health: Unselling heart disease. Journal of Communication, 1975, 25, 114-126.

Maccoby, N., Farquhar, J. W., Wood, P. D., & Alexander, J. Reducing the risk of cardiovascular disease: Effects of a community-based campaign on knowledge and behavior. Journal of Community Health, 1977, 3, 100-114.

McAlister, A., Puska, P., Koskela, K., Pallonen, U., & Maccoby, N. Mass communication and community organization for public health education. American Psychologist, 1980, 35, 375-379.

McGuire, W. J. Theoretical foundations of campaigns. In R. E. Rice & W. J. Paisley (Eds.), Public communication campaigns. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications, 1981.

Mendelsohn, H. Some reasons why information campaigns can succeed. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1973, 37, 50-61.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Ostheimer, R. H. Frequency effects over time. Journal of Advertising Research, 1970, 10, 19-22.

Pais, J., & White, P. Family redefinition: A review of the literature toward a model of divorce adjustment. Journal of Divorce, 1979, 2, 271-281.

Palmgreen, P., & Clarke, P. Agenda-setting with local and national issues. Communication Research, 1977, 4, 435-452.

President's Commission on Mental Health. Report of the task panel on public attitudes and use of media for promotion of mental health (Publication No. PCMH/P-78/22). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Ray, M. L., Sawyer, A. G., & Strong, E. C. Frequency effects revisited. Journal of Advertising Research, 1971, 11, 14-20.

Roberts, D. F., & Bachen, C. M. Mass communication effects. Annual Review of Psychology, 1981, 32, 307-356.

Rosnow, R. L., & Robinson, E. J. Experiments in persuasion. New York: Academic Press, 1967.

Sabota, W. L., & Cappas, A. T. Semantic differential changes associated with participation in a public lecture series describing the emotional and behavioral consequences of divorce. Journal of Divorce, 1979, 3, 137-151.

Severin, W. J., & Tankard, J. W., Jr. Communication theories: Origins, methods, uses. New York: Hastings House, 1979.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Spanier, G. B., & Casto, R. F. Adjustment to separation and divorce: A qualitative analysis. In G. Levinger & O. C. Moles (Eds.), Divorce and separation: Contexts, causes, and consequences. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Spivey, P. B., & Scherman, A. The effects of time lapse on personality characteristics and stress on divorced women. Journal of Divorce, 1980, 4, 49-59.

Utah Department of Health. Quarterly vital statistics report. Bureau of Health Statistics, 1981, 4, 1-4.

Wallerstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. B. Surviving the breakup: How children and parents cope with divorce. New York: Basic Books, 1980.

Wedel, H. L. Characteristics of community mental health center operations in small communities. Community Mental Health Journal, 1969, 5, 437-444.

Weiss, R. S. The emotional impact of marital separation. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 135-145.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

Zeiss, A. M., Zeiss, R. A., & Johnson, S. M. Sex differences in initiation of and adjustment to divorce. Journal of Divorce, 1980, 4, 21-33.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Campaign Messages

THE CYCLE OF DIVORCE

By James C. Gardiner

"I can't believe it happened to us. Only a year ago we were saying, 'Why can't other couples be like us?' We were happy . . . at least I thought he was. He must have had something else on his mind, because one day he came home and said 'That's it, Jenny. I'm leaving. I want a divorce.' I couldn't believe it was happening."

"I wish she would let go and realize that our marriage is over. I must get five or six calls a week from her, wanting me to fix a door or decide about the kids' teeth. Can't she see that I'm finished with her?"

"Some days I feel true love for him, and really miss him. Other days I would like to find him and tear him apart. He's so smug with his leather jacket and the new truck he bought with the money he is supposed to be sending to support me and the kids. Who does he think he is?"

"She's the one who has it made. She has the house and gets to be with the kids every night. She has no idea how lonely I am. I've lost my family and everything I've worked for in the last 12 years."

"I hear he's found a cute young secretary and is living with her up in a mountain cabin. I tried for years to get him to buy a cabin, but he said he hated the mountains. Now we know how he really felt."

"Last night I drove by the house and Harry's truck was there. I didn't want that dirty creep around my kids, so I went in and dragged him out of there."

When you're divorced, it's hard to think straight. Many conflicting thoughts and emotions flood your mind, and sometimes you can't sort them out.

But your feelings didn't get into that state of disarray overnight, and you won't likely get over it by the next day. You soon learn that divorce has a number of stages. You experience a downward cycle as the relationship dies. Then there's a difficult climb ahead as you attempt to rebuild your life.

Disappointment. The first stage in the downward spiral of your marriage comes with the realization that things are not as you had hoped and dreamed they would be. You didn't know that he would be so sloppy at the table or so impatient with the kids. You had expected him to take you out to dinner at least once a week, and now it has been five months since the two of you went out alone.

You didn't realize that she was so dependent on her father, and that she would take more stock in his advice about buying cars than she would in yours. You thought her complexion was naturally beautiful, and didn't know how much time and money would have to be invested in her makeup.

Many couples who hit the disillusionment stage sit down and talk over their fears and disappointments. They resolve the differences and their relationship grows stronger. Others, however, let their marriage go on downhill.

Erosion. Like the soil that washes away with the rain, the dying relationship dissolves a little at a time. It begins when you avoid talking about issues, or secretly store up resentment against your partner.

The spirit of cooperation and love that you had in the beginning gradually deteriorates into conflict. You stubbornly resolve to prove him wrong on every issue he brings up. You develop the habit of leaving and joining your friends down at the club every time she is in a bad mood.

There is a nagging feeling inside you that something is going wrong, but you tell yourself, "I have my pride," and put off making the first move to change things.

Detachment. Eventually you turn away from each other and seek meaning and adventure from other persons. You wake up to realize that all your efforts are directed toward the children, and that he is no longer an important part of your life. You start counting back to the last time you made love, and you can't even remember when it was.

You find a beautiful young friend down at the club who listens patiently to all your concerns. You suddenly feel like a man again, and you would do anything for her.

Back home, however, the cold war continues. It becomes a standoff to see who will leave first. You vaguely sense that the breakup is coming, but you don't want to face the fact.

The split. Parting is normally the most traumatic stage in the divorce cycle. After the split, you can no longer put up a front for your friends or family. You now have to explain things to the children. You now have to worry about supporting two households.

Regrets haunt you: Maybe I shouldn't have been so tough on him about the broken pitcher. Maybe I shouldn't have picked up that girl at the golf course. To top it off, you have a legal decision to make: do we divorce or don't we?

Indecision. After the split, a love-hate relationship often develops. One day you feel madly in love with her and show up on her doorstep with flowers. The next day you feel deep disgust and wish you could get the flowers back and throw them at her.

The debate within yourself continues: We can work it out. No, it's hopeless. If only I had done things differently . . . and on and on. Eventually you can look back with a more humorous perspective about how you finally decided the marriage was over. Some examples . . . .

"I knew it was over when she invited me to her place to celebrate our 15th anniversary, and I walked in on a beer party with her new boyfriend."

"I knew it was over when he kept driving past my house with his girlfriend, checking to make sure no men were visiting me."

"I knew it was over when she got drunk for the first time in her life just before we were supposed to get together and talk things over."

"I knew it was over when he told me there was no money for the kids' clothes, then took off on a vacation with one of his friends."

"I knew it was over when I drove 500 miles to visit her where she was staying with her parents, and when I got there everyone in her family came out to meet me but her."

"I knew it was over when he came home drunk every night and called me by someone else's name as I put him to bed."

"I knew it was over when I asked her if she missed me since our separation and she said 'not really . . .'"

"I knew it was over when I gave him my strong opinion and he said, 'If you're trying to be assertive, it's a little too late.'"

"I knew it was over when after we made love she said 'I have never enjoyed you. I only do it for your sake.'"

"I knew it was over when I called him at his mother's house and his 14-year-old sister said, 'May I tell him who's calling?'"

The indecision stage finally ends when you get up the courage to tell yourself, "It's time to see a lawyer!"

Denial. The denial step usually happens early in the divorce cycle. It is so difficult to face what is happening to you that you let your mind play little tricks on you.

One common type of denial is the "yahoo" syndrome. Even though you are hurting desperately, you kick up your heels and shout, "I'm free at last!" You go out on the town, meet new people, and have the time of your life. But underneath, the pain continues.

Another type of denial is called "now we're friends." You and your ex start dating again, and announce "that divorce really did the trick. We are now closer and more friendly than when we were married!" You soon realize that you are fooling only yourselves. Your friendship follows the same dead end path as your marriage.

Mourning. When the full weight of the divorce finally crashes down on you, and you feel a great sense of loss, you are in the mourning stage. You feel depressed, defeated, hopeless, and bitter. You think there is nothing to live for. You think you can't go on.

Yet, you know you won't kill yourself, because there's the kids and the possibility of that new job. Maybe there's even a better life ahead without all the fighting, if you can ever get your ex cleared out of your system.

Eventually the depression lifts. You can sleep, and you feel like eating again. You even gain some hope for the future.

Anger. One of the signs that the mourning phase is about over is when you start expressing the anger you have felt all along. "Why should I wallow here in my room while he's out there living it up with his girlfriend?"

The anger seems to come out in every meeting with her. You blow up at her because you thought she was unreasonable about your visit with the kids.

Eventually you learn that angry feelings are a natural part of divorce, and you discover that you can channel your feelings into tennis or running. You soon regain control.

Acceptance. Until now you've been bouncing from fury to fear, from denial to depression, and from ecstasy to exasperation. You wonder if you will ever settle down and stop cycling through the emotional stages of divorce.

Ultimately, however, you learn to accept what happened. You know you have adjusted when you can see and talk with him without getting angry or having an anxiety attack. A friend can mention her and you talk calmly rather than swear and call her names.

In short, you finally say to yourself, "I am okay. I was married to him (her) and it didn't work out. I am not blaming him (her) and I am not blaming myself. I learned a lot from my marriage that will help me in the future. I will make it."

Taking new risks. The final stage in the divorce cycle is learning to risk yourself again. You may decide to start a new career, or just take a class in photography. You start believing in yourself again.

You even get interested in members of the opposite sex again, but for the right reasons. You aren't exploiting, playing games, or desperately searching for closeness. You are whole again, ready to give again, and much wiser from what you've been through.

DEALING WITH YOUR EX

By James C. Gardiner

Once you adored that person, and now you can't stand to be around him. A few short years ago you were dating. You thrilled to be in her presence, and hoped that some day she would be yours.

You waited for his phone calls, and turned down all other dates. When he called, you were tongue-tied and silly. He was the most important person in your life.

When you got married, you had all the hopes and dreams in the world holding you up there on cloud nine. You resolved that everything would be perfect in your haven of love.

You wouldn't be like all the others you knew who fought or bickered or played silly games like "separation and reconciliation." And certainly the word "divorce" never entered your vocabulary.

Divorce was reserved for the soap operas, or that alcoholic couple across town. They must have hated each other from the beginning, you told yourself.

Then it got closer. A distant relative got divorced. You thought, well, they obviously weren't giving their marriage a full effort. They could have worked it out.

Then divorce moved into your circle of friends. The couple who you thought had everything, who went on the Acapulco honeymoon, whose daddy put a down payment on their house, and whose kids were the cutest you had ever seen, got divorced.

"Why can't they be like us?" you asked. "We have such a great thing going." You asked your divorced friends, "Why couldn't you just work things out?" They shook their heads and said, "You don't understand."

Then divorce started tapping gently at your door. Maybe it started with the second job that kept him away six nights a week, or the feeling of resentment over her being so close to her best friend, or the disagreement about which church the children would be raised in.

A few neglectful months or years later, you found your relationship in deep trouble. Those nagging doubts about him turned into hostility. After a fight you caught yourself saying, "Do I really hate her? What made me say those awful things?"

You felt confused, betrayed, and resentful. It wasn't supposed to happen to you. Your marriage went sour and turned into a battlefield. Maybe you even came to physical blows. Or maybe the two of you just gave up, walked away, and the marriage died on the vine.

When the person you committed your life to finally left, you found yourself feeling confused. Once you deeply loved him. When he was gone, the feelings turned to resentment, anger, and even though you didn't want to admit it, sometimes hate.

You once trusted her with your thoughts, feelings, dreams, and even your car. After things went bad, you felt like you couldn't even tell her you were going to the post office.

He was always the one who turned you on. One look at him, and you felt yourself melting. As it ended up, you cringed with cold disgust whenever he came near you.

She was the most beautiful girl in the world. She even won a beauty contest and had the best legs in town. But after your experiences with her, she seemed cheap. You found your feelings mixed between what you once had with her, and what you eventually got stuck with.

After the divorce, many of your feelings toward your ex turned to their opposites: love to hate, attraction to repulsion, and liking to disliking. However, one feeling stuck with you. It was the feeling that the two of you still belonged together.

When you were separated from him, you felt like half of you was missing. You wanted to search him out, bring him back, and feel complete again.

Dr. Robert Weiss, a Harvard divorce counselor, calls that feeling "attachment." His research found that most divorced couples continue to long for each other, even after feelings of love, respect, and sexual attraction have died. Dr. Weiss found that attachment continues as long as divorced couples continue seeing each other. It dies only when couples stay apart, form new relationships, and let time take its healing course.

Another question you asked as you were adjusting to divorce was, "Why do I act the way I do around my ex?" You felt awkward around her, and didn't know what to do or say. You came off like macho man, even though you didn't mean to.

Once when he brought the kids back on Sunday night, you met him at the door wearing his favorite low-cut sweater. "Why did I do that?" you asked. "It didn't make sense, because he certainly doesn't turn me on anymore."

You tried to act natural around her, but you were straining so hard to be natural that you felt like you were acting out a scene from a John Wayne movie.

One day after a long serious talk with him, the two of you decided that you could be good friends, even though you were divorced. You were both excited, and he asked you out for the next Friday night.

After he left, you said to yourself, "What am I doing? I just divorced this man, and now I'm going to date him? I must be out of my mind!" Anyway, Friday night came and he didn't show up.

Eventually you found the answer to your question about why you acted so awkwardly around your ex. Your discomfort was part of learning to unlove another person. You had to untangle the mixed emotions. Since no one has ever trained you on how to accomplish that, you had to do it by trial and error.

Finally you got to the bottom line question, which was "How do I want to relate to my ex in the future?" Your mixed feelings of love and hate, attraction and repulsion, or attachment and detachment had kept you so confused that you hadn't really thought about the future.

Then you faced the issue and asked yourself, "Am I willing to give up this person that I once loved?" The answer was "yes." Then you made a list of resolutions that went something like the following:

RESOLVED, that I will let my ex lead his(her) own life, and will never seek out, spy on, or interfere with my ex.

RESOLVED, that I will talk over my resentments and feelings about my ex with a friend or a counselor, and will lay my bad feelings to rest.

RESOLVED, that I will build a new life of my own, completely separate from my ex.

RESOLVED, that if my ex should interfere in my new life, I will be assertive, even to the point of obtaining a legal restraining order, if necessary.

RESOLVED, that I will never use my children to punish or fight with my ex.

RESOLVED, that from now on I will refer to him as my EX-husband (not my husband) or to her as my EX-wife (not my wife).

RESOLVED, that I will give each new person I meet a fresh start, and will never compare him or her to my ex.

YOUR CHILDREN AND YOUR DIVORCE

By James C. Gardiner

Back when you were in the heat of your marriage, you told yourself that the kids would certainly be better off when you got out of that miserable situation. You wanted to stop the fighting and make a peaceful life for you and the children.

But you didn't know what you were in for then. After the divorce, five-year-old Andy cried every night for his daddy. It was very difficult to get him settled down and to sleep. Seven-year-old Andrea wouldn't eat most of the time. You even thought she was giving up on life. And 13-year-old Millie's foul mouth was unbearable. She criticized everything you did and accused you of driving her father away. Your life with the children was unlivable at times.

You asked yourself, "How will my children turn out? Will they suffer from this experience for the rest of their lives? What kind of marriage partners will they be? Will they even want to get married? What can I do to make their lives happier, and survive this ordeal?"

Then you found a book by Judith Wallerstein and Joan Kelly titled Surviving the Breakup, and learned that after five years of research on 60 divorced families, they have many good ideas to help divorced parents.

Wallerstein and Kelly found that children who experienced a good outcome from divorce had certain things in common. First, they had a close relationship with the parent who had custody (usually the mother). The successful parent was psychologically stable and spent time with the children. She was warm and supportive, and instilled self-confidence in her children.

Second, the successful children had regular visits with the absent parent (usually the father), and continued to have a close relationship with him. The researchers found that as divorced children became teenagers, they needed their fathers even more.

Third, the children who were well adjusted had a strong support system of friends, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, and teachers. They knew that a network of people out there cared about them.

Fourth, the happy children were economically stable. While most divorced families had financial difficulties, the adjusted families did not feel destitute or deprived. They felt a sense of financial security.

With this information in mind, you were able to set the groundwork for helping your children through the divorce. You kept a good relationship going between you and them, you promoted regular visits with the absent parent, you encouraged interaction with the rest of the family and friends, and you struggled to make your limited income work for your family's needs.

Your relationship with the children was easy to control. You spent time with them, showed your love for them, and thoughtfully answered all their questions about the divorce. Things went well with them, except for the times when you were tired, moody, or depressed. But that was okay. Everyone has those times.

But what about the visits with their father? They were not the best. The children enjoyed it when he came for them, but he was unpredictable. When he did come, he tried to seduce you, or the two of you erupted into a fight. It was a bad scene.

Then you decided that you could make improvements. You wrote a letter to your ex and proposed a new visitation schedule. The visits would be frequent and regular, so the children would benefit from his influence.

To your great surprise, he agreed on the plan! Then you strictly followed it through. At 6:30 p.m. the next Friday the children were ready, properly equipped, and waiting out front for their father to pick them up. You watched from the kitchen window.

When he drove up, they went to meet him and you stayed in the house. When he came to the door, you answered, but did not invite him in. When he started talking about you, you changed the subject to the children. He soon got the idea that you had a plan and would stay with it.

Soon the new arrangement became routine, and you noticed how the children enjoyed their father more, and seemed more settled when they arrived home. You also felt relieved, once the visitation problem was under control.

As a father, you also learned things to help your children through the divorce. Your visits became more regular and you thought of more activities to plan with the children. At first you took them over to your new apartment and visited. But they got tired of sitting there watching you make out with your new girlfriend, and you stumbled onto a new idea that worked wonders.

One day you asked the children what they would like to do on their visits. Billy said he wanted to work on a model airplane, so the next time you scheduled that. Sue wanted to go to the park, and that made a fun outing for everyone.

Eventually you found that ice cream, movies, expensive gifts, and exciting trips were not what they wanted, even though you felt you owed it to them to do something spectacular. They just wanted to be with you, to have you listen to them, and to feel that you consider them important. When you learned how to do that, you saw many more smiles.

As divorced parents, you found it was very difficult to stop using the children to fight with each other. She took you for everything you had. There's no way you can get back at her, except to turn the kids against her. He disgraced you, and feels no regrets about what he did. You withhold the children from him, whenever you feel like it.

Once he planned a trip to the ice show with the children. You felt bitter and resentful that day, remembering the time you caught him with his girlfriend before the divorce. On the spur of the moment you packed up the children and went to the mountains for a picnic, so they wouldn't be there when he called for them. Later you felt ashamed of what you had done, and called to apologize. Another fight started, and you felt more miserable afterward.

You found you were still trying to prove her wrong. You learned that she told Freddy he couldn't have the new bicycle he wanted because he wasn't taking care of the yard. With great pleasure you presented Freddy with the bicycle, right in front of her.

Finally, one day you both came to your senses and called a truce on ex-spouse warfare via the children. After that you concentrated on your own relationship with each child, and never mentioned your ex to the children. The children have liked that arrangement, and you have had a lot more fun with them since the battle stopped.

Yes, the kids will make it too, you kept telling yourself. They can bounce back from anything, provided they have stability and hope for the future. They know you care about them. They know you will never reject them. And, they know you are only human, doing your best for them.

DIVORCE, FRIENDS, AND FAMILY

By James C. Gardiner

What happens to your social life when you get divorced? Well, you know the stereotypes about divorced persons. People think you are always out on the town, falling into bed with a different partner every night, and having the time of your life.

But you know what really happens, don't you? You work hard all day, come home exhausted to find the baby sitter didn't bother with the dishes, the dirty clothes, or the giant pile of toys in the living room. You spend your evening torn between spending time with the children and tackling one of the 16 messes staring you in the face.

Or, if you don't have children, you could be deciding which bar to go to, where the least undesirable people hang out, so you can drink, relax, and ease the pain of loneliness.

You may even spend a quiet evening at home alone, sick of the TV but watching it anyway. You may just wallow in bed, feeling sorry for yourself, trying to decide whether to call someone to get together for the evening. Finally bedtime arrives and you give up for the night.

Thinking back, you wonder what happened to the close circle of friends and family you had when you were married. You mentally run through your list of old friends, most of them married.

Gary was your best friend. You fished together. When you got divorced, he brought his truck over and helped you move. That night he said, "Just call me if there's anything I can do for you." Once he and his wife brought you a covered dish for dinner, but they seemed kind of distant. Every time you've called him, he's been busy, and he has never called you. Things have changed between you and Gary.

You think back to Will and Sarah. You and the ex used to take vacations with them, and the four of you would check out the new restaurants in town together. Now when Sarah calls to invite people to her dinner parties, she doesn't know whether to invite you or your ex. So, she calls neither of you, and you both get left out.

You're thankful for Andy. Since the divorce, he has never let you down. Many a night he and Fran opened their home and hearts to you for a consoling talk into the wee hours, a good rest in their guest bedroom, and a hot breakfast to send you off the next day. You know you'll never be able to make it up to them, but some day you'll pass the favor on to a friend in need.

However, when you looked back on your married life, you realized that you were lonely then also. You went to sleep in bed, while he went to sleep in front of the TV. You spent your evenings at the bowling alley, while she was at the bridge club. There was always a newspaper or book separating you. You talked only when it was necessary for the survival of the household.

When you finally separated from your ex, it became harder to deny your loneliness. Then you were both alone and lonely. That helped you face the fact and start to solve the problem. You discovered that your loneliness came from within, because you didn't like yourself.

To solve the loneliness problem, you started doing the things you always wanted to accomplish, like taking guitar lessons or reading that series of books on Norway, or finishing the rock wall that you started six years ago in the back yard.

Eventually you began liking yourself again, and gained confidence in your abilities. You became content. You found that you could be alone without being lonely. You could be in a crowd and feel that you belonged. You built back your most valuable asset--a belief in yourself.

You were ready to face any situation that came up with your family or friends. You had faced yourself, accepted what you saw, and were ready to proudly present that person to the world.

But you wondered, where can I go to meet new people? Certainly married persons aren't excited to make friends with a divorcee. Divorced persons seem to have a limited sphere of influence in our society.

You tried the bars and found them superficial and limited for meeting people. Many persons were there medicating their anxieties and depressions with alcohol. Others were playing silly boy-girl games, searching desparately for human closeness through one night stands. Still others were there to exploit, and take out their angry feelings toward their ex on some poor victim. You found the bar a dangerous and painful scene.

Finally you discovered that the place to meet new people was wherever you happened to be. You found that being friendly and open to conversation were more important than knowing where to prowl for meeting people.

You went to the library and met someone at the card catalog. You commented on her hand tooled leather purse, and she said her ex-husband made it. You stumbled onto a new relationship.

You enrolled in a class for single parents, and shared your experiences with the group. After class, you talked with another person who had the same problems with his children.

Friendliness counts more than fate in finding and meeting new people. You discovered that you could practice your newfound friendliness anywhere, from the gas station to the swimming pool, from the laundromat to church, or from the P.T.A. to the park.

Thus, you shed the destructive labels of "divorced," "despondent," and "desperate." You took on a new attitude that commuicated "I am okay," "I am friendly," and "I like you." As a result, you found new friends waiting at every corner.

In summary, you learned that when you got divorced, your relationships with friends and family changed. You found who your true friends were. Others rejected you when you needed them most. Most important of all, you learned how to make new friends, to win back your family, and to build a support system that was stronger than before.

YOUR FUTURE AFTER DIVORCE

By James C. Gardiner

When you first were divorced, you may have passed through the "yahoo" stage, when you felt free and excited. You believed that all your troubles were over, and life was beginning again. That was a great feeling.

Then difficulties piled up and you got depressed. You wondered if you had done the right thing, getting divorced. It was harder to be divorced than you had expected. The children were not adjusting well, and you didn't know your ex could be so unreasonable, sarcastic, or unpredictable.

After a few weeks of misery, you asked yourself, "How long does it take to get over a divorce? When will I feel normal again? Will I ever be able to just let go and have fun? Do I have a happy future ahead?

You decided to read some of the research studies on the long-range effects of getting divorced. You found that Mavis Hetherington of the University of Virginia studied the adjustment patterns of 48 couples over a two-year period. She found that most couples had extreme difficulty adjusting to the first year of divorce. However, the second year brought about a dramatic improvement for most divorced persons.

The second study you read was done by Judith Wallerstein of the University of California. She studied 60 divorced families for a five-year period and found that it took most men two years to recover from a divorce. The women took an average of three years to overcome the problems faced in a divorce.

You found those results discouraging and resolved that you wouldn't take that long. You wondered, how can I speed up the process and start feeling good again?

You began by developing an attitude of acceptance. You accepted yourself, along with your strengths and weaknesses. You even began to like yourself. Then, you accepted your divorce as a part of your life. It was not what you planned, expected, or even wanted. But it happened, and there was nothing you could do after the fact to change it.

You even accepted your ex as a different person in your life. "He is no longer my husband," you told yourself. "He is a single man and can have a life of his own."

"She is no longer my wife," you finally admitted, "and I have no claim over her. She can do as she pleases." You finally accepted those new arrangements as a fact of life.

Once you learned to accept your divorce, you took an even longer step toward your new future when you asked, "What did I learn from my marriage and divorce?"

You began by looking back and comparing yourself with the way you were a month, a year, or five years before. You found you had learned a great deal about life. You were wiser on many issues. You knew what you would have changed, if you had it all to do over.

As you looked back, you found that your marriage got into a rut. You grew comfortable with always preparing the same dinner, always sleeping in until after he left for work, and always watching the same TV shows in the afternoon.

When you analyzed your relationship with her, you remembered the times you took her for granted. You forgot to thank her for all the wonderful baking she did. You never noticed how careful she was to get your laundry just right.

You thought back about how divorce made you feel so unattractive, so unwanted, so undesirable. You wondered whether anyone of the opposite sex would ever look at you again. But then you lost 30 pounds, saved for some attractive clothes, and started taking pride in your appearance again. You soon found that you could feel attractive again.

Without a doubt, the most important thing you learned from your divorce was that you can do more than you ever dreamed. You didn't know you could get a master's in microbiology, but you did it! You had no idea that you could have custody of the children, hold down a demanding job, and still keep the family intact. There were times when gloom surrounded you, and you didn't think you would make it. But somehow you pulled through and found you had great strength as a result.

After your feelings stabilized and you started dating again, you asked another critical question: "Will I ever remarry?" The immediate answer, of course, was "ABSOLUTELY NOT!" But after a number of attractive persons passed through your life, you began to look more seriously at the possibility of marrying again.

You pondered the fact that four out of every five divorced persons remarry, and most of them do so before age 30. You also considered that most divorced persons marry other divorced persons. You learned that while 33% of all first marriages end in divorce, nearly 50% of all second marriages fail. That scared you.

But then you realized that there are two kinds of remarriages. The first is the "rebound" type, in which the person is lonely and desperate and will accept any arrangement that looks promising.

The person on the rebound has not reached the acceptance stage of the divorce cycle. Unfortunately, this person will have to recover from the divorce while also trying to adjust to a new marriage. It can be done, but it is a monumental task.

The second kind of remarriage is the "adjusted" type. As an adjusted person, you go into a new marriage for the right reasons. The battles of the past have been fought and finished. Your new partner gets 100% of the new you. You are refreshed, able to give, and strong from the suffering you have experienced with the divorce.

As a person who has learned from the previous marriage, you can be a better marriage partner this time. You know what pitfalls to look for. You realize that when you feel irritated by the way she handles the children, you had better talk with her about it. You are confident that the resentful feelings you have about his exotic business trips to Nevada can be resolved if you talk them out.

You are grateful for a second chance, and you make this marriage count. You go out together on a date every weekend. You think of her throughout the day and call her during the afternoon. You get up extra early, fix his lunch, and put a love note in his lunch box. Your new partner greatly benefits from what you learned in your previous marriage.

Yes, your visit to the world of divorce often ends with a new marriage. If you took time during the divorce to experience your feelings, to accept the divorce, and to learn from your experience, your next marriage can be the one you always hoped for.

THE MYTHS OF DIVORCE

By James C. Gardiner

As the divorce rate has continued to grow, so have the number of myths about divorce. Here are some new and old ideas about those myths.

MYTH #1: DIVORCE IS FUN, EXCITING, AND ROMANTIC. Divorce can look very appealing to the unhappily married person. Divorce offers the prospects of dating, freedom from family responsibility, and the single life again.

However, as divorce researcher Mavis Hetherington has said, "few are prepared for the traumas and stresses they will find." Divorce certainly is not fun. It is traumatic and can destroy a person's self-confidence.

MYTH #2: DIVORCED PERSONS ARE IRRESPONSIBLE AND UNSTABLE. The stereotype of the "wild divorcee" has hurt the reputation of many good persons. Our society needs to correct this error in thinking and consider another view of the divorced person.

She may be the gal just down the block who goes to work everyday, tries to live on $550 a month, rushes home to be mother and father to three children every night, tosses and turns half the night trying to get to sleep, and wonders whether her depression will ever lift.

He may be the guy out driving half the night in his truck, lonely and confused, missing his children, sick of restaurants and macaroni-and-cheese dinners, and looking for a better-paying job.

MYTH #3: THE MAN HAS IT MADE IN DIVORCE WHILE THE WOMAN SUFFERS. Recent studies by Judith Wallerstein and by Mavis Hetherington have shown that both men and women suffer from the effects of divorce. The women suffer from an overload, as they attempt to be breadwinner, mother, father, homemaker, etc. The men suffer as they leave the familiar surroundings and learn to live without children, a wife, or a home they have worked to established.

In the long run, women appear to benefit more from divorce. Judith Wallerstein's study of 60 divorced families showed that women agonized, organized, beautified, educated, and generally bettered themselves from the divorce experience.

On the other hand, men tended to coast through the divorce. They felt just as devastated, depressed, defeated, and guilty about divorce as the women. However, not as many men went through soul-searching, agonizing, and changing from their situation. Thus, they did not grow as much as the women did.

MYTH #4: FIGHTING IN A MARRIAGE IS WORSE ON THE CHILDREN THAN GETTING A DIVORCE. Many couples rationalize that "the children would be better off if we got a divorce." However, Wallerstein's study showed that the children suffered far more from the divorce than they did from the fighting that took place before the divorce.

Even though the children sensed the problems between their parents, they felt more secure and better taken care of before the divorce than they did after the breakup. Thus, the old saying, "let's stay together for the sake of the children," is given new life by modern research.

MYTH #5: LET'S GET MARRIED, AND IF THINGS DON'T WORK OUT WE CAN EASILY GET A DIVORCE. Many engaged couples who are not sure of each other decide to get married anyway. They think that divorce is as simple as seeing a lawyer, going to court, then walking away free again.

However, few couples realize the degree of pain the divorce pathway holds. Hetherington concluded that there is no such thing as a victimless divorce. At least one member of the divorced family suffers untold agony. Divorce is seldom the easy way out.

THE EFFECTS OF DIVORCE

By James C. Gardiner

While viewing divorce as a statistic or undesirable social problem, it is easy to overlook the divorced person. How does divorce affect those involved? Each divorce experience is unique to the persons who go through it. However, researchers have found that most divorced persons are deeply affected emotionally, as parents, legally, economically, and socially.

Emotional effects. For many, divorce brings on strong feelings of defeat, failure, shame, regret, and guilt. Most experience a degree of loneliness never felt before. They feel as though there is nowhere to turn for comfort.

Feelings of anger, hostility, and frustration are also common. Depression, helplessness, hopelessness, and anxiety are close companions of the divorced person during the early stages of recovery. Given those traumatic emotional effects, it is not surprising that the suicide rate among divorced persons is twice that of married persons.

Parenting effects. Divorced parents face many difficulties, including telling the children about the divorce, keeping from using the kids as a weapon against each other, worrying about the effects of the divorce on the children, and arranging suitable visitation for the children and absent parent.

The divorced mother, who usually gains custody of her children, experiences a significant change of roles. She suddenly becomes mother, father, breadwinner, housekeeper, maintenance person, etc. for her family.

The divorced father, on the other hand, is normally separated from his home, wife, and children. He feels a deep void in his life and must find new activities to fill in. He feels awkward about returning to visit his children and often decides to stay away.

Legal issues. Separating persons who decide to divorce must agree on a legal settlement that will be comfortable to live with in the future. This is a difficult task, particularly for someone in an unsettled state of mind. Many persons sign divorce papers hastily, without looking down the road to the results of the agreement they have signed.

For example, "reasonable visitation" with the children may mean 48 hours a week to the hopeful father and four hours a month to his disgusted ex-wife.

Divorced persons also must untie all former joint ownerships and common business dealings. When not completely dissolved, those ties can cause later embarrassing moments or bitter fights.

Economic effects. The first effect on the economy of a divorced person is a substantial loss of income. The average income of a female-headed family is roughly one-third that of an intact family. When the family is headed by a single male, the income is roughly two-thirds that of a family with both mother and father.

The divorced parent's income-producing ability is also hampered, as babysitting, child support, and alimony payments bite into the take-home pay. In addition, many employers view divorced persons as bad employment risks and pass over many good workers who desperately need the job.

Social effects. Probably the most devastating effect of divorce is the social stigma placed on the divorced persons. Former friends, even family members, often grow cold and distant to the divorced person, as if to say "don't come near me . . . I don't want to catch what you've got" or "you've disgraced us."

Prior to divorce, the couple was invited to many parties and get-togethers. Once they are separated, friends don't know which one to invite and don't want to take sides. Usually neither person gets invited, and both lose the support of their friends.

Thus, divorce affects many aspects of a person's life. The emotional, parental, legal, and social effects can be overwhelming to the person who didn't plan to be divorced in the first place.

GETTING HELP FOR DIVORCE RECOVERY

By James C. Gardiner

The needs of divorced persons vary from finances to furniture, from self-esteem to a shoulder to cry on, from repairs to relief from the kids, from a place to live to a plan for the future.

While still married, the person could turn to a companion when problems arose. They were a problem-solving team who had a future together.

Even after separating, however, the first tendency was to turn to the estranged spouse for help with problems. Dr. David Chiriboga of the University of California found that roughly one-third of separated persons turned to their spouses for help, even after the separation.

However, those persons soon realized that the spouse was no longer a companion, a team member, or a helper. Chiriboga discovered that only about 1% of the separated persons found their spouses helpful in solving problems.

Eventually, the divorced person learns the value of a "support system," which is the total package of help available to a person who needs it. The person who successfully recovers from divorce will build a new support system and will skillfully use it to survive.

For one person, a support system may include an understanding father, a neighbor who helps with repairs, jogging, a class in single parenting, and an inspirational book or two.

Another person's system may be a deep religious conviction that brings strength, a spiritual leader who truly cares, painting, and a close friend who is available day or night.

Still another person may have a satisfying job, a supportive group of co-workers, a counselor who listens and guides, and a garden that pays dividends in fruits, vegetables, and a sense of accomplishment.

Whatever the makeup of the support system, the recovering divorced person will need to use the system wisely. Even sources of help can be worn out, if overused.

Friends, for example, have been rated as the most turned to and the most helpful sources of support for divorced persons. However, seeing the same friend night after night and re-hashing the same mournful problem into the early morning hours can send a friend over to the enemy list.

The recovering person must have a variety of help sources available, so that an important friend or family member won't be worn out. If the problems get too burdensome for the persons involved, professional help can be sought.

In short, the traumas of divorce dictate that few can survive the ordeal alone. Each divorced person must assess his or her needs and design a support system that will sail through the difficult times.

Meanwhile, the rest of us can caringly participate in those support systems.

DEALING WITH DIVORCE

By James C. Gardiner

To close this series on divorce, we turn to several local leaders for advice on how to deal with a dissolved marriage. These persons have advised many divorced persons on legal, religious, financial, and psychological issues.

First, attorney Reed Hadfield observed that many unhappily married persons expect divorce to solve their problems. However, they find that divorce merely changes the focus of the difficulties. Whatever the issues were before the divorce, after the breakup the conflict usually centers around alimony, child support, custody, or visitation.

Hadfield stated that if couples are to survive divorce, they must develop a mature attitude and be willing to make the best of the difficulties and inconvenient situations that arise.

Pastor Robert Copeland of the First Baptist Church commented that the greatest need divorced persons have is to regain a sense of self-worth. He advised divorced persons to draw closer to God and to rely on their religious beliefs to overcome feelings of guilt and worthlessness.

Pastor Copeland also challenged divorced couples to react calmly to each other when handling child support and visitation issues. Even though one temper may flare, fights can be averted when the other person reacts peacefully.

President Jerry Twitchell, First Counselor in the Brigham City South LDS Stake, concluded that divorced persons need love and acceptance from their peers, friends, and family members. He advocated that those around the divorced person give plenty of positive feedback. He said to emphasize their good points and tell them what you appreciate about them. Twitchell stated that everyone needs at least three instances of positive feedback for every instance of negative feedback.

In the financial area, Vice President Ferrin Lovell of the First Security Bank stated that divorced persons can bring back feelings of self-worth by handling finances effectively. He advocated establishing a budget to give better financial control and a sense of where the money is going. He also stated that everyone should habitually save, even if it is a dollar from each paycheck. Seeing money grow will help recover good feelings.

Finally, Nels Sather, Administrator of the Bear River Community Mental Health Center in Box Elder County and marriage and family counselor, said that divorced persons need to build a strong support system in order to survive. "Even more important," he stated, "is that divorced persons know that the anguish they experience is normal, and that the discomfort will end, given time and effort."

This series has shown that divorce is traumatic, devastating, and difficult to deal with when it comes to children, friends, family, finances, and emotions. However, given time, a strong support system, and a belief in yourself, divorce can be conquered.

Appendix B

Newsletter

THE DIVORCE RECOVERY NEWSLETTER

June 27, 1981

Dear Divorced Person,

July has been declared DIVORCE RECOVERY MONTH in Box Elder County. This event has been organized to help ease some of the pain that divorced persons may be feeling. Here are some of the events planned for Divorce Recovery Month:

FREE DRAWINGS AND GIVEAWAYS by local merchants. Watch the local papers and listen to KBUH Radio for details.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES on overcoming divorce problems. During July, watch the Box Elder News and Journal, Tremonton Leader, and Ogden Standard Examiner for articles. Some of the topics:

* The Myths of Divorce
* Dealing with your children
* Dealing with you ex
* The Effects of Divorce
* Getting help if you need it
* Social effects of divorce

TELEVISION PROGRAMS. Be sure to watch "One Day At A Time," a serious comedy about a divorced family, on Channel 5 at 12:30 p.m. weekdays and at 7:30 p.m. Sundays.

RADIO PROGRAMS, PROMOTIONS, AND SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS. Stay tuned to KBUH Radio during July for many events on divorce recovery. Here are some planned shows for the next month on KBUH (800 AM, 107 FM)

* Tuesday, June 30, 10:30 a.m. The cycle of divorce.
* Thursday, July 2, 10:30 a.m. What is divorce like for others?
* Tuesday, July 7, 10:30 a.m. Managing your money alone.
* Thursday, July 9, 10:30 a.m. Divorce and the law.
* Monday, July 13, 10:30 a.m. Divorce and your church, Part 1.
* Thursday, July 16, 10:30 a.m. Divorce and your church, Part 2.
* Monday, July 20, 10:30 a.m. How to deal with your ex.
* Thursday, July 23, 10:30 a.m. How to help your children through divorce.
* Monday, July 27, 10:30 a.m. Dealing with your friends and family.
* Thursday, July 30, 10:30 a.m. Your future: Is there life after divorce?

"You were a half person. Now you are filling in the other half.
You are becoming a whole person, perhaps for the first time."
Earl Grollman (1978)

Recommended books on divorce:

1. Creative Divorce, by Mel Krantzler. M. Evans & Company, New York, 1974.

   This book takes you through the cycle of divorce, step by step, from the point of view of a divorced person. It is inspirational and very helpful.

2. Living Through Your Divorce, by Earl A. Grollman and Marjorie L. Samms. Beacon Press, Boston, 1978.

   Written in poetry form, with pictures, this book is very inspirational.

3. The American Way of Divorce, by Sheila Kessler. Nelson-Hall, Chicago, 1975.

   If you want to learn the facts, statistics, myths, cycles, etc., of divorce, this book is well written, interesting, informative.

4. How To Parent Alone, by Joan Bel Geddes. Seabury Press, New York, 1974.

   This book deals with how to get on your feet, then how to be effective with your children, as a single parent.

5. Explaining Divorce to Children, edited by Earl A. Grollman. Beacon Press, Boston, 1969.

   An excellent collection of ideas from children, religious leaders, lawyers, and parents.

6. You're Divorced, But Your Children Aren't, by T. Roger Duncan and Darlene Duncan. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1979.

   Written by a lawyer and marriage counselor, this book is practical, fun, and very helpful for divorced parents.

7. How Does It Feel When Your Parents Get Divorced? by Terry Berger. Julian Messner, New York, 1977.

   An outstanding book written for elementary school age children. The pictures are moving, and the story is very helpful.

8. How To Get It Together When Your Parents Are Coming Apart. by Arlene Kramer Richards and Irene Willis. David McKay Company, New York, 1976.

   This is a fun, easy-reading book for teenagers whose parents are divorcing.

9. The Second Time Around, by Leslie Aldridge Westoff. Viking Press, New York, 1977.

   A good book on dealing with new relationships, remarriage, and new families with "yours, mine, and ours."

10. What Every Man Should Know About Divorce, by Robert Cassidy. New Republic Books, Washington, D. C., 1977.

    Written by a divorced man, this book helps men deal with the difficult emotions and situations surrounding divorce.

BRIGHAM CITY CORPORATION
P.O. BOX A • BRIGHAM CITY, UTAH 84302 • PH 801-734-2001

JUNE 11, 1981

PETER C. KNUDSON
MAYOR

PROCLAMATION

GIVEN THE RISING DIVORCE RATE IN BOX ELDER COUNTY, GIVEN THE UNTOLD AMOUNT OF SUFFERING THAT DIVORCED MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN OUR COUNTY HAVE ENDURED, AND GIVEN OUR DESIRE TO HELP EASE THAT SUFFERING, WE HEREBY DECLARE JULY AS

DIVORCE RECOVERY MONTH.

IN NO WAY DO WE DESIRE TO GLAMORIZE OR PROMOTE DIVORCE BY THIS PROCLAMATION. WE CALL ALL CITIZENS OF BOX ELDER COUNTY TO SEEK SPECIAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE PLIGHT OF DIVORCED PERSONS AND THEIR CHILDREN, AND TO ENCOURAGE THOSE PERSONS AS THEY RECOVER. WE EXTEND A SPECIAL INVITATION TO DIVORCED PERSONS WHO MAY FEEL ISOLATED IN THEIR SUFFERING TO COME FORWARD AND TAKE A LONGER STEP TOWARD RECOVERY DURING JULY. FINALLY, WE ISSUE A CHALLENGE TO ALL FAMILIES IN OUR COUNTY TO STRENGTHEN THEIR TIES, AND THUS PREVENT DIVORCE FROM GROWING AS IT HAS IN THE PAST.

PETER C. KNUDSON, D.D.S.
MAYOR

Appendix C

Rating Scale for Professionals

MESSAGE RATING SCALE

Please rate the message you just read (or heard) by circling one number on the scale after each of the following statements.

1. The message was easy to understand.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

2. The message was generally appropriate to the standards, tastes, and values of the citizens of Box Elder County.

6	5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree

3. The message was consistent with the current state of knowledge on divorce.

6	5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree

4. The message would likely be helpful to the divorced persons of Box Elder County.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

5. The writing (or speaking) was polished and well done.

6	5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree

6. The writer (or speaker) was believable.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

7. Comments regarding the message:

Thank you!

Appendix D

Rating Scale for Divorced Persons

MESSAGE RATING SCALE

Please rate the message you just read (or heard) by circling one number on the scale after each of the following statements.

1. The message was easy to understand.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

2. The message told about things that were very similar to my experience with divorce.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

3. The message was very helpful to me.

6	5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree

4. The message would probably be helpful to other divorced persons.

6	5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree

5. The writing (or speaking) was polished and well done.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

6. The writer (or speaker) was believable.

6	5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Moderately agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Moderately disagree	Strongly disagree

7. Do you have any comments regarding the message?

Thank you!

Appendix E

Demographic Questionnaire

DIVORCE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your present marital status?
   ___Divorced
   ___Remarried to someone new
   ___Remarried to the same person

2. Age:
   ___19 or under
   ___20-29
   ___30-39
   ___40-49
   ___50-59
   ___60 or over

3. Sex: ___Female ___Male

4. Religious preference:
   ___None
   ___Catholic
   ___Jewish
   ___LDS
   ___Protestant
   ___Other_____

5. How long were you married? _____years, _____months

6. How many children do you have?_____

7. How many of your children now live with you?_____

8. How many persons do you have that you feel comfortable talking with about your divorce?_____

9. Approximately how many hours did you spend with those persons during July?_____

10. Have you sought professional counseling since you got divorced? ___Yes ___No

    If yes, approximately how many sessions have you attended?
    ___1 to 3
    ___4 or more

11. What was your family's attitude toward your marriage in the first place? (check one)
    ___Totally in favor
    ___Somewhat in favor
    ___Neutral or undecided
    ___Somewhat opposed
    ___Totally opposed

12. Who first brought up the idea of getting a divorce?
    ___I did
    ___My ex did
    ___We both did

13. What was your family's attitude toward your divorce? (check one)
    ___Totally in favor
    ___Somewhat in favor
    ___Neutral or undecided
    ___Somewhat opposed
    ___Totally opposed

14. At the time of your separation, what was your attitude toward getting a divorce?
    ___Totally in favor
    ___Somewhat in favor
    ___Undecided
    ___Somewhat opposed
    ___Totally opposed

Appendix F

Attachment Measure

DIVORCE QUESTIONNAIRE--2

1. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel today? (check one)
   ___I feel free and relieved, like a weight has been lifted off my shoulders.
   ___I feel empty inside like an important part of me is missing.

2. Which statement best describes how you felt at the end of June? (check one)
   ___I felt free and relieved like a weight had been lifted off my shoulders.
   ___I felt empty inside like an important part of me was missing.

3. Which statement best describes how you feel today? (check one)
   ___I have put the past behind me and I am looking forward to the future.
   ___The past is always on my mind; I keep going over what happened in my last marriage.

4. Which statement best describes how you felt at the end of June? (check one)
   ___I had put the past behind me and was looking forward to the future.
   ___The past was always on my mind; I kept going over what happened in my last marriage.

5. Which statement best describes how you feel today? (check one)
   ___I feel like a new person changing for the better all the time.
   ___I am in a rut; my life isn't going anywhere.

6. Which statement best describes how you felt at the end of June? (check one)
   ___I felt like a new person changing for the better all the time.
   ___I was in a rut; my life wasn't going anywhere.

7. How much do you miss your ex-husband/ex-wife now? (circle one)

   A great deal 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

8. How much did you miss your ex-husband/ex-wife at the end of June? (circle one)

   A great deal 5 4 3 2 1 Not at all

9. How would you describe your present feelings toward your ex-husband/ex-wife? (check one)

   ___Not much of anything
   ___Not liking much anymore
   ___Hating
   ___Liking but not loving
   ___Loving alot
   ___Both loving and hating

10. How would you describe your feelings toward your ex-husband/ex-wife at the end of last June? (check one)

   ___Not much of anything
   ___Not liking much anymore
   ___Hating
   ___Liking but not loving
   ___Loving alot
   ___Both hating and loving

Appendix G

Depression, Anxiety, and Hostility Measure

SCL-90-R

Name:_____ Technician:_____ Ident. No._____

Location:_____ Visit No.:_____ Mode: S-R_____ Nar_____

Age:_____ Sex: M_____ F_____ Date:_____ Remarks:_____

INSTRUCTIONS

Below is a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Read each one carefully, and select one of the numbered descriptors that best describes HOW MUCH DISCOMFORT THAT PROBLEM HAS CAUSED YOU DURING THE PAST_____INCLUDING TODAY. Place that number in the open block to the right of the problem. Do not skip any items, and print your number clearly. If you change your mind, erase your first number completely. Read the example below before beginning, and if you have any questions please ask the technician.

EXAMPLE

HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:

Descriptors
0 Not at all
1 A little bit
2 Moderately
3 Quite a bit
4 Extremely

Answer

Ex. Body Aches..... Ex. [3]

HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:

Descriptors
0 Not at all
1 A little bit
2 Moderately
3 Quite a bit
4 Extremely

Headaches.....
Nervousness or shakiness inside.....
Repeated unpleasant thoughts that won't leave your mind..
Faintness or dizziness.....
Loss of sexual interest or pleasure.....
Feeling critical of others.....
The idea that someone else can control your thoughts....
Feeling others are to blame for most of your troubles.....
Trouble remembering things.....
Worried about sloppiness or carelessness.....
Feeling easily annoyed or irritated.....
Pains in heart or chest.....
Feeling afraid in open spaces or on the streets.....
Feeling low in energy or slowed down.....
Thoughts of ending your life.....
Hearing voices that other people do not hear.....
Trembling.....
Feeling that most people cannot be trusted.....
Poor appetite.....
Crying easily.....
Feeling shy or uneasy with the opposite sex.....
Feelings of being trapped or caught.....
Suddenly scared for no reason.....
Temper outbursts that you could not control.....
Feeling afraid to go out of your house alone.....
Blaming yourself for things.....
Pains in lower back.....

28. Feeling blocked in getting things done.....
29. Feeling lonely.....
30. Feeling blue.....
31. Worrying too much about things.....
32. Feeling no interest in things.....
33. Feeling fearful.....
34. Your feelings being easily hurt.....
35. Other people being aware of your private thoughts.....
36. Feeling others do not understand you or are unsympathetic.....
37. Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you.....
38. Having to do things very slowly to insure correctness...
39. Heart pounding or racing.....
40. Nausea or upset stomach.....
41. Feeling inferior to others.....
42. Soreness of your muscles.....
43. Feeling that you are watched or talked about by others..
44. Trouble falling asleep.....
45. Having to check and doublecheck what you do.....
46. Difficulty making decisions.....
47. Feeling afraid to travel on buses, subways, or trains.....
48. Trouble getting your breath.....
49. Hot or cold spells.....
50. Having to avoid certain things, places, or activities because they frighten you.....
51. Your mind going blank.....
52. Numbness or tingling in parts of your body.....

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE

SCL-90-R

HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:	Descriptors 0 Not at all 1 A little bit 2 Moderately 3 Quite a bit 4 Extremely
53. A lump in your throat	☐
54. Feeling hopeless about the future	☐
55. Trouble concentrating	☐
56. Feeling weak in parts of your body	☐
57. Feeling tense or keyed up	☐
58. Heavy feelings in your arms or legs	☐
59. Thoughts of death or dying	☐
60. Overeating	☐
61. Feeling uneasy when people are watching or talking about you	☐
62. Having thoughts that are not your own	☐
63. Having urges to beat, injure, or harm someone	☐
64. Awakening in the early morning	☐
65. Having to repeat the same actions such as touching, counting, washing	☐
66. Sleep that is restless or disturbed	☐
67. Having urges to break or smash things	☐
68. Having ideas or beliefs that others do not share	☐
69. Feeling very self-conscious with others	☐
70. Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie	☐

HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:	Descriptors 0 Not at all 1 A little bit 2 Moderately 3 Quite a bit 4 Extremely
71. Feeling everything is an effort	☐
72. Spells of terror or panic	☐
73. Feeling uncomfortable about eating or drinking in public	☐
74. Getting into frequent arguments	☐
75. Feeling nervous when you are left alone	☐
76. Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements	☐
77. Feeling lonely even when you are with people	☐
78. Feeling so restless you couldn't sit still	☐
79. Feelings of worthlessness	☐
80. The feeling that something bad is going to happen to you	☐
81. Shouting or throwing things	☐
82. Feeling afraid you will faint in public	☐
83. Feeling that people will take advantage of you if you let them	☐
84. Having thoughts about sex that bother you a lot	☐
85. The idea that you should be punished for your sins	☐
86. Thoughts and images of a frightening nature	☐
87. The idea that something serious is wrong with your body	☐
88. Never feeling close to another person	☐
89. Feelings of guilt	☐
90. The idea that something is wrong with your mind	☐

VITA

James Carl Gardiner
Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: A Mass Media Campaign to Promote Divorce Adjustment

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical Information:

Personal Data:

A. Born in Gordon, Nebraska, on November 8, 1943.
B. Grew up on a cattle ranch near Martin, South Dakota.
C. Married to Cindy Lee Page on May 15, 1975.
D. Have three sons: Daniel, Jeremiah, and Adam.
E. Hobbies: long distance running, cross country skiing, and music (trumpet, piano, and Middle Eastern drums).

Education:

A. Ph.D. in Speech-Communication from Michigan State, 1969.
B. M.A. in Speech from the University of Nebraska, 1966.
C. B.A. in Religion from Union College, 1965.
D. Graduated from high school at Campion Academy, Loveland, Colorado, 1961.

Professional Experience:

A. Psychologist at the Bear River Community Mental Health Center, Brigham City, Utah, 1978 to present.
B. Vocational Counselor at the Veterans Hospital, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1974-1978.
C. Graduate Assistant, University of Utah, 1972-1974.
D. Assistant Professor of Speech, Colorado State University, 1969-1972.
E. Graduate Assistant, Michigan State, 1967-1969.
F. Instructor of Speech, Wayne State College, 1966-1967.
G. Graduate Assistant, University of Nebraska, 1965-1966.

Publications:

A. Cowan, R. A., & Gardiner, J. C. Communication variables among drug users. North Carolina Journal of Speech and Drama, 1974, 4, 3-13.
B. Gardiner, J. C. A synthesis of experimental studies on speech-communication feedback. Journal of Communication, 1971, 21, 17-35.
C. Gardiner, J. C. The effects of perceived receiver response on source attitudes. Journal of Communication, 1972, 22, 289-299.
D. Gardiner, J. C. Vocational characteristics of substance abusers admitted to a therapeutic community. In A. J. Schecter (Ed.), Drug dependence and alcoholism. New York: Plenum Press, 1981.
E. Gardiner, J. C. Winning over employers: A comprehensive approach to job placement with substance abusers. In A. J. Schecter (Ed.), Drug dependence and alcoholism. New York: Plenum Press, 1981.
F. Layton, K., & Gardiner, J. C. Justifications for calling in national guard troops during a campus demonstration: A study of student attitudes. Student Development Report, 1971, Colorado State University, 7, 5.
G. Scott, R. M., & Gardiner, J. C. Vocational rehabilitation for substance abusers: A model program. In A. J. Schecter (Ed.), Drug dependence and alcoholism. New York: Plenum Press, 1981.